

Policy Group – 17 May 2017

Scheme of delegation in relation to planning matters

1. Purpose of report

To set up a PDP to review how the scheme of delegation is working in relation to referral of planning applications.

2. Key issues

- 2.1 At a meeting of the Leaders' Forum in March 2017, members requested that a report be submitted to Policy Group to set up a task and finish group to review the current scheme of delegation in relation to determining planning applications.
- 2.2 Since July 2014, if a District Councillor wishes to refer an application to Planning Committee, a meeting is arranged with the case officer, the Councillor, the Development Manager and / or the General Manager and the Chair of Planning Committee. At the meeting, the attendees discuss the key issues and decide whether it should be referred to Planning Committee. The Chair of Planning Committee has the final say. This meeting is minuted.
- 2.3 Many of these meetings have been helpful in enabling the Ward Member to articulate their concerns and that of the community. When the issues are discussed in more depth, if the request is declined by the Chairman, the Ward Member more fully appreciates the material planning considerations and can separate these out from issues which the planning system cannot take into account (covenants, possible second homes etc.). The minute of the meeting is useful for explaining the issues to objectors / supporters / town and parish councils.

3. Recommendation

- (i) Policy Group establishes a policy development panel (PDP) to review the scheme of delegation in relation to determining planning applications.
- (ii) Subject to approval of the above recommendation, Policy group agrees the makeup of the PDP to include four councillors: the Chair of Planning Committee; two additional Conservative Councillors and one Liberal Democrat Councillor to be nominated by the group leaders

4. Policy issues

4.1 How will this affect the environment, social issues and the local economy?

Processing planning applications in an effective, open and transparent way is an important part of the democratic process. It directly contributes to all five of the Council's priorities.

4.2 Implications

4.2.1 Resources

The recommendations in this report can be delivered within existing budgets.

4.2.2 Equalities

None

5. Further information

- 5.1 Since July 2014 when the current system was implemented there have been 16 requests for delegated applications to be referred to Planning Committee. Of these 7 were referred and 9 were not. In addition, in the same period, officers have referred 10 delegated applications to Planning Committee.
- 5.2 **Appendix 1** contains a summary of the current scheme of delegation. **Appendix 2** contains a summary of the Ward Member requests for referral to Planning Committee as well as a summary of the referrals to the Planning Committee from the General Manager - Planning and Community Services and the Development Manager. **Appendix 3** contains the minutes of the meetings documenting the decisions to refer or not following Councillor requests to refer an application to Planning Committee. For one of the applications (6/2015/0255), there are no minutes because the officers were instructed to have further discussions with the applicant. These happened and Councillors were satisfied with the conditions suggested which overcame their issues.

Members have requested a PDP be established to consider concerns from some councillors that the process puts excessive control in the hands of the Chairman of the Planning Committee. It is suggested that the PDP meets to review the appendices to this report and decide whether it wishes to make any changes to the current process set out in paragraph 2.2 above. The proposed makeup of the PDP is set out in the recommendation and the Solicitor to the Council, the General Manager Planning and Community Services and the Development Manager will provide technical advice to the PDP.

Appendices:

- 1 - Summary of the current scheme of delegation**
- 2 - Summary of referrals**
- 3 - Minutes of referral request meetings**

For further information contact:-

Bridget Downton, General Manager, Planning and Community Services

Planning applications that Planning Committee always determines

The Planning Board always determines the following types of planning applications:

- Within the settlement boundaries of Swanage, Upton and Wareham, applications for development or change of use resulting in:
 - 5 dwellings or more;
 - gypsy / traveller sites of 5 pitches or more of 0.5ha or more.
- Anywhere else in the District, applications for development or change of use resulting in:
 - 2 dwellings or more;
 - gypsy / traveller sites of 2 pitches or more of 0.3ha or more.
- Applications for development or change of use resulting in commercial development exceeding 500m² outside land designated in the Local Plan as employment land or town and local centres.
- New schools.
- Applications that would require referral to the Secretary of State.
- Applications for two or more wind turbines.
- Applications for solar farms that are proposed to generate 50KW or more, or with an area of 0.5ha or more.
- Applications for approval of reserved matters relating to design, access and layout where the Planning Committee determined the outline application
- Applications where the applicant or agent is a councillor or the spouse or civil partner of a councillor.
- Applications where the applicant or agent is an officer of the Council or the spouse or civil partner of an officer of the Council.
- Applications where the Council owns the land.

Planning applications that Planning Committee may determine

- Applications where:
 - officers intend to determine in conflict with a representation from a parish or town council, a neighbour or other representor; and
 - in the professional opinion of the General Manager Planning and Community Services or the Development Manager, the representation relates to a material planning consideration and consideration of the planning matters is finely balanced.
- Applications where a councillor has requested in writing (within 28 days of the publication of the weekly list to the General Manager Planning and Community Services or the Development Manager) that the Planning Board consider the application; and either
 - in the professional opinion of the General Manager Planning and Community Services or the Development Manager, the representation relates to a material planning consideration and consideration of the planning matters is finely balanced; or
 - in the opinion of the Chair and / or Vice Chair of Planning Board, the Planning Board should determine the planning application.
- Applications where for any other reason the General Manger Planning and Community Services or the Development Manager believes the Planning Board should determine them.

Councillor requests for referral resulting in a meeting where the chairman referred the application to the Planning Committee with minuted reasons why

Application reference and description	Planning Committee	Cllr requesting
6/2016/0335 - Sandford - Two temporary classrooms.	August 2016	Cllr Ezzard and Unsworth
6/2015/0683 - Acton - Worth Matravers - Self-build affordable home.	January 2016	Cllr Lovell
6/2015/0466- Acton, Worth Matravers - Single storey extension to dwelling	September 2015	Cllr Lovell
6/2015/0296 - Nursery Bridge Farm - Temporary agricultural workers accommodation	July 2015	Cllr Lovell
6/2014/0710 – Swanage - Erect two new dwellings	March 2015	Cllr Trite
6/2014/0457 – Kimmeridge - Erect temporary statue	October 2014	Cllr Kenward
6/2014/0480 - Lytchett Matravers - Erect dwelling	October 2014	Cllr Taylor

Councillor requests for referral resulting in a meeting where the chairman did not refer to the Planning Committee with minuted reasons why not

Application reference and description	Date	Cllr requesting
6/2016/0675 – Swanage – Erect a garage	February 2017	Cllr Morris and Cllr Trite
6/2016/0653 – Upton – Erect four houses	January 2017	Cllr Drane
6/2016/0667 – Briantspuddle – Single storey extension	December 2016	Cllr Miller
6/2016/0493 – Upton – Erect pair of semi-detached houses	November 2016	Cllr Drane
6/2016/0099 - Upton - Two storey rear and single storey extension to dwelling	March 2016	Cllr Drane
6/2015/0497 - Wareham - Single storey extension to dwelling	October 2015	Cllr Goodinge
6/2015/0379 - Lulworth -Demolish existing dwelling and rebuild replacement dwelling	August 2015	Cllr Quinn
6/2015/0167 – Swanage - Raise ridge height, extend and insert dormer	July 2015	Cllr Suttle and Cllr Trite
6/2015/0276 – Swanage - Erection of entrance barriers at caravan park	June 2015	Cllr Suttle
6/2015/0191- Lytchett Matravers - Erect extension to care home	May 2015	Cllr Taylor
6/2014/0286 - Corfe Castle - Erect dwelling	July 2014	Cllr Dragon
6/2014/0281 - Worth Matravers - Erect outbuilding	May 2014	Cllr Lovell

Councillor requests for referral that were resolved with officer discussion with applicant

Application reference and description	Date	Cllr requesting
6/2015/0255 - Langton Matravers - Erect detached single storey dwelling	June 2015	Cllr Lovell

Items referred by GM and / or DM that could have been determined by officers under scheme of delegation

Planning Committee	Application reference and description	Reason
January 2017	6/2016/0451 – Wareham - Alterations and extensions to bungalow	Finely balanced
August 2016	6/2016/0148 – Lytchett Minster - Crematorium	Previous committee involvement and greenbelt issues
June 2016	WD/D/16/000378 – Crossways – Consultation on large mixed use development	Broader impacts in relation to wider district including partial review
January 2016	6/2015/0532 – Worth Matravers – Wood henge	Unusual nature of the proposal
January 2016	6/2015/0703 – Sandford – Care home	Significant proposal and change of use
September 2015	6/2015/0478 – Wareham – Railway bridge	Broader impacts for Wareham area
March 2015	6/2015/0100 – Swanage – Changes to plans for 5 new dwellings	Previous site history
March 2015	6/2015/0107 – Kimmeridge – Sculpture	Previous site history and unusual nature of proposal
October 2014	6/2014/0463 – Lytchett Minster - Crematorium	Previous committee involvement and greenbelt issues
August 2014	WD/D/14/000885 – Consult on wind farm application in neighbouring district	Impact on several Purbeck parishes
August 2014	6/2014/0084 – Lytchett Minster - Crematorium	Previous committee involvement and greenbelt issues

**Planning Application No 6/2016/0335 – Sandford St Martin CE VA
Primary School, Sandford, BH20 7BN**

Meeting room 2, Thursday 27 July 2016 @ 3.30pm.

Present:-Councillor Peter Wharf, Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillors Beryl Ezzard and Mark Unsworth, District Councillors for St Martin Ward.

Officers in attendance: S Leonard, Principal Planning Officer; A Davies, Development Manager and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillors Ezzard and Unsworth had requested a meeting with the Chairman of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2016/0335 be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the application was for a temporary portable building on the site of Sandford St Martin Primary School for a period of 5 years. The proposed building would be utilised for use as two temporary classrooms with toilets providing additional teaching space during the school day and as a venue for before and after school care. Over the weekends the temporary classrooms would be utilised as a small catering and toilet facility for groups using the school site, including local sports clubs using the adjacent sports pitches.

The school was sited within the Green Belt where inappropriate development was not allowed unless there were very special circumstances. The Green Belt policy listed development which is deemed to be appropriate, and with respect to new buildings, this included limited infilling of previously developed sites. Officers believed the school site could be classed as a previously developed site (brownfield land), and therefore the proposal fell into one of the categories that permits development in the Green Belt. This was on the basis that it would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it. Officers felt that as the applicant had requested a temporary planning permission for 5 years for the temporary building (whilst alternate long term building was explored) and given the stated need for the school itself, and wider community benefit, they were supporting the proposal.

Councillors Ezzard and Unsworth considered that the position of the temporary facility was inappropriate within the Green Belt and would not fit in within the street scene. The additional temporary structure was considered to be unnecessary as the school was currently under subscribed and provision could be made within the existing building.

Councillor Ezzard further stated that “the use proposed for this temporary classroom had been overstated; ie that of replacing the wrap around care for an out of school club. This has and will remain, provided for by the well established Charity for over

23 years. (Ref. Purbeck School's Review provision by DCC)". The Chairman advised that this was not a material planning consideration.

The Chairman gave careful consideration to the issues and agreed that the application should be referred to the Planning Committee at its meeting on 31st August 2016 to enable the Committee to consider the Green Belt issue and the impact of the building upon the street scene.

The meeting ended at 4.07pm.

**Planning Application No 6/2016/0683 – Acton, Land Adjacent Enzeli
BH19 3JS**

Meeting room 1 Wednesday 27 January 2016 @ 1.45pm

Present:-

Councillor Peter Wharf, Chairman of the Planning Committee and Councillor Mike Lovell ward Member for Langton.

Officers in attendance: Steve Boyt, Principal Planning Officer; A Davies, Development Manager and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Lovell requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2016/00683 be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The application site lies within the Acton Conservation Area, Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Purbeck Heritage Coast. There are also some listed buildings close to the application site.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the application was for a self build affordable house in the garden of an existing property. The development would be for a detached house, with a pitched gable roof. First floor accommodation would be provided in the roof space with pitched roof dormers in the eastern and western roof slopes. The eastern and northern sides of the site are enclosed by a Purbeck stone walls. He explained that the officer had not yet finalised recommendation and there were issues yet to be resolved with the applicant.

Councillor Lovell stated that the impact on the listed buildings surrounding the proposed development needed to be carefully considered. He stated that a Holly tree sited in the garden should be protected and further concern was highlighted that the proposed red brick chimney was out of keeping with the neighbourhood; he considered that the history of the village would be lost if its heritage was not protected. He considered that the access to the proposed development was in a dangerous place.

The Parish Council considered that the proposed height of the development was too high and did not accord with the plans.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the proposed development was in a conservation area therefore, all of the trees would be protected and that he had asked the applicant for more information to assess the impact on these trees. He also stated that the conservation area appraisal did reference red brick chimneys in the Acton Conservation Area. The Design and Conservation Officer had considered that the application would not have a harmful affect on the Conservation Area or the

setting of neighbouring listed buildings and did not raise any objections to the proposal.

The Chairman considered that the application at this time should not be referred to the Planning Committee.

He asked officers to notify him and Councillor Lovell when information with regard to:

- the height, dimensions and depth of the application site and proposed house had been checked for its accuracy;
- the Council's Trees Officer had considered the further information relating to the impact of the proposed development on trees;
- a section 106 agreement for ensuring that the house remained affordable in perpetuity;
- the use of red bricks to form the chimney of the proposed house; and access/car parking arrangements for the proposed house and 'Enzeli' had been reviewed by the applicant and the Highways Engineer.

The meeting ended at 14:15

Planning Application No 6/2015/0466 and Listed Building consent application 6/2015/0467- Harris's Cottage, Acton, Langton Matravers, BH19 3JS

Meeting room 2 Wednesday 2015 @ 2.00pm

Present:-

Councillor Peter Wharf Chairman of the Planning Committee and Councillor Mike Lovell District Member for Langton Ward.

Officers in attendance: Ros Drane, Planning Officer; Alan Davies, Development Manager and Tina Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Lovell had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2015/0466 and Listed Building consent application 6/2015/0467- Harris's Cottage, Acton, Langton Matravers, BH19 3JS be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Planning Officer outlined the application explaining that Harris's Cottage was a grade 2 Listed building sited in the AONB in the open countryside and in a conservation area. It was a traditional vernacular cottage.

The applicant had engaged with the Design and Conservation Officer in the pre-application stage at which time the officer stated his concern with the impact on the character and setting of the listed building and the conservation area. It was considered that by extending the already extended building the result would be an elongated building that moved the eye away from the centre of the listed building. The proposed design did not relate well in its setting and the proposed roof lighting would appear to clutter and detract from the character of the building. Officers stated the CO policy of the Local Plan that extensions should not be disproportionate to the original building.

Members reviewed the plans for the proposed extension and noted the size and materials to be used. It was noted that the proposed roof lights would enable the residents to gain space in the proposed extension.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee carefully considered the application and considered that the issues were finely balanced and warranted debate by the Planning Committee.

Meeting ended at 2.52pm

Planning Application No 6/2015/0296- Valley Road (Nursery Bridge Farm), Harmans Cross, BH19 3DX

Meeting room 1 Thursday 29 July 2015 @ 2.30pm

Present:-

Councillor Peter Wharf Chairman of the Planning Committee and Councillor Mike Lovell Ward Member for Langton Ward.

Officers in attendance: Alan Davies, Development Manager; Jonathan Maidman, Senior Planning Officer and Tina Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Lovell had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2015/0296- Valley Road, Nursery Bridge Farm, Harmans Cross, BH19 be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the application was to site a mobile home on agricultural land for a temporary period of time. The site lay within the countryside and AONB in Harman's Cross. The site currently has a large agricultural building on it. There is also a mobile home located in the south-eastern corner of the smallholding which the Council granted a lawful development certificate for in January 2012 (application reference 6/2011/0706). The applicant is proposing to expand his business by increasing the number and type of animals on the land. In order to expand the business and provide the necessary care to his animals, the applicant considers it is essential for him to live on site, especially during the breeding period.

Officers were proposing to grant planning permission for a 3 year period in order to ascertain if the business was sustainable and viable. Officers had consulted an agricultural specialist (Mr Roger Sewill) to seek advice regarding the care for the animals and to ascertain the amount of care needed for the proposed livestock. His report was circulated to Members at the meeting.

Councillor Lovell considered that the following criteria had not been established:

- the essential need to live on the site; and
- evidence that the business was financially sustainable.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee considered that concerns regarding the essential need for accommodation to be on-site in the AONB and the sustainability of the business had not been evidenced, for those reasons the application should be referred to Planning Committee for determination.

Meeting ended at 3.10pm

Meeting held on 1 Wednesday 28 January 2015 at 3.30pm

Present:-

Councillor P K Wharf, Chair of the Planning Committee and Councillor Mrs G A Marsh, District Councillor for Swanage North (representing Councillor W Trite).

Officers in attendance: B Downton, General Manager- Planning and Community Services; A Davies, Development Manager; S Leonard, Principal Planning Officer and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor W Trite, District Councillor for Swanage North, had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2014/0710- 4 Hill View, Swanage be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The General Manager explained that the planning application had been submitted by the applicant in response to an enforcement investigation. She explained that the buildings are currently being constructed. The developer acknowledges that they will be higher than the approved plans. He has therefore submitted an application with a revised height that is just under half a metre higher than the approved plans. The current application plans also propose to obscure glaze the rear-most east elevation window of the bungalow, which was previously approved as clear glazed. The officers have visited the site and are satisfied that that there is not enough difference between what is being built and the approved plans to constitute significant harm to warrant taking enforcement action. They asked for the current planning application to be submitted so that a condition can be added to ensure obscure glazing to the rear elevation bungalow window. This will also give the chance to add a condition to ensure enhanced landscaping on the rear boundary.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the original planning permission was granted in March 2011 and that a revised scheme was later approved in April 2014. The revised scheme increased the footprint of both dwellings and increased the height of part of the 2-storey element of the dwelling.

A new allegation suggests that the buildings are not being constructed in accordance with the approved footprint. Officers have revisited the site and taken measurements relating to the footprints of the buildings and their position relative to neighbouring properties to determine whether what is being built is in accordance with the current application plans. If it is, they will determine the application. If it is not, they will ask the applicant to withdraw this application and resubmit with drawings that accurately reflect the position on the ground. The new application would then be the subject of a further consultation with neighbours and others. Regardless of whether the buildings are in accordance with the plans, they are not close enough to any other properties to constitute significant harm to warrant taking enforcement action.

The Chairman considered Cllr Trite's reasons for seeking referral to the Planning Committee in turn and his response is given below:

Cllr Trite's reasons for seeking referral	Chairman's response
<p>1. The number of local residents who will be adversely affected if this variation is granted and enforcement not applied is relatively large. The number of local residents who will be adversely affected if this variation is granted and enforcement not applied is relatively large.</p>	<p>Planning permission has already been granted for two properties on this site. Officers have visited the site and taken a series of measurements. I am satisfied with their explanation that there is not enough difference between what is being built and the approved plans to constitute significant harm to warrant taking enforcement action.</p>

<p>2. I cannot agree that the height of this development has only been exceeded by about 18 inches. To me it looks more like a couple of metres.</p>	<p>I have asked officers to monitor development and if the finished height is significantly greater than that in the revised plans, we will have a discussion about next steps. At the moment, it looks as if the finished height will be within reasonable tolerance levels of the re-submitted plan height (which is just under 0.5 metre higher than the approved plans).</p>
<p>3. The plans have been significantly abused in all three dimensions, thereby significantly and adversely impacting upon other people.</p>	<p>I am satisfied that the officers have visited the site and come to the view that the changes to the built version compared with the approved version do not constitute significant harm to warrant taking enforcement action. Officers will be imposing planning conditions to ensure the rear-most window in the east elevation of the bungalow is obscure glazed and to ensure appropriate boundary landscaping as well. It is also worth pointing out that many developments vary slightly from the approved plans. Provided this is within acceptable tolerances, this is perfectly normal.</p>
<p>4. Public concern on this scale becomes an issue of good (or bad) democratic representation.</p>	<p>The number of respondents is not a material planning consideration and I do not consider that it is a relevant point in determining which applications should go to Planning Committee.</p>

The Chairman of the Planning Committee decided not to refer this planning application to the Planning Committee. He asked officers to monitor the finished height of the development and let him know if it significantly exceeded the height as set out in the re-submitted plans. He also requested that the site be added to the councillors' annual inspection of completed developments.

The meeting ended at 4.30pm

**Planning Application No 2/2014/0457 – Clavell Tower, Kimmeridge,
BH20 5PG**

Meeting room 1 – 10 October 2014

Present:-

Councillor Mrs B Kenward, Ward Member for Creech Barrow and Councillor P K Wharf Chairman of the Planning Committee.

Officers in attendance A Davies, Development Manager; T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer and J Hartigan, Planning Officer

Consideration of planning application:

Councillor Mrs Kenward had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request a review of planning application no 6/2014/0457. Arising from the meeting, the following matters were addressed:

The Planning Officer presented a application to erect a temporary sculpture by Sir Antony Gormley to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Landmark Trust. The sculpture would be located at Clavell Tower, Kimmeridge, Dorset for a period of 1 year.

The Development Manager informed the meeting that it was in his view the application could be dealt with at officer level, as the issues did not have implications for the District as a whole and the temporary proposal did not undermine the policy in the Local Plan.

The meeting was informed that the structure would be bolted to a concrete base and that following concerns raised by the District Engineer it was agreed the sculpture would be repositioned further away from the cliff edge, to prevent any unsettling of the land. Any soil that was taken away during the construction of the base would have to be retained in order that it could be reinstated when the structure and foundations were removed and the surrounding land be returned to its original state, this would overcome the concerns of the District Engineer .

The Planning Officer informed the meeting that 2 objections had been received to the application, one from the Parish Council and the other from a local resident.

The Dorset AONB Landscape Planning Officer considered that the sculpture was of a modest scale and given its temporary duration, no harm would occur to the interests of the AONB. Dorset County Council Highways Authority had raised no objections to the application given that Kimmeridge was already a well established tourist attraction. The authority did not consider that there would be any wider implications if the application was approved. Officers further explained that no objections were raised from Natural England subject to conditions.

The Ward Member for Creech Barrow spoke. She requested that the application be heard by the Planning Committee as she considered that the circumstances of the application were exceptional.

Concerns were raised with the siting of the sculpture, although it had been agreed that the sculpture would be sited further away from the cliff edge, it was believed that in order to view the sculpture, visitors would still have to walk very close to the edge of the cliff to take photographs and have a full view of the sculpture this could result in putting people in danger as the surrounding land was considered to be fragile.

It was further noted that Dorset County Council's Highways Authority had not objected to the application on the grounds that the village and the proposed siting of the sculpture was already in a popular tourist area. Local residents found that although parking was available to visitors to Kimmeridge, it was often the case that on discovering what was considered to be a relatively small charge for the day's car parking, visitors were often seen to resort to parking in the village and on local roads resulting in difficulties for the local community. 150,000 cars had been counted through the toll gate during the year 2012 but those figures had only reflected visitors during the weekends, Spring and Summer as that was the only time the toll gate was manned and vehicles were counted. The actual number of visitors to the area was considerably higher. Kimmeridge produced good things for the whole of Purbeck and the tourist industry, local roads already competed with tankers transporting fuel, caravans being towed, visitors to camping sites, cyclists and the farming community all adding to the already busy roads in the area, putting a strain on the local community. Further concerns were raised that the building of the Etches Museum with its attendant traffic would coincide with the installation of the statue. It was considered that the wider implications of the application being approved should be considered by the Planning Committee.

In response to questions from the Chairman of the Planning Committee officers informed the meeting that there was no specific guidance given to the erection of the sculpture and given that it was temporary and of a small scale, the application was within the guidelines stated in the Policy CO Countryside. If the application were for a permanent structure, the application would not be supported by Officers.

The Chairman considered that the application should be determined by the Planning Committee, stating that he had concerns that the structure really would be temporary and that the public should have a full understanding of that definition. He raised further concerns that given the sculpture would be bolted to a concrete base, its construction and subsequent removal should be considered by Planning Committee. It was noted that if the application had been for a permanent structure Officers would have recommended refusal.

The meeting ended at 3:35pm

**Planning Application No 2/2014/0480 – Huntick Estate (10) Lytchett
Matravers BH16 6EB**

Meeting room 3 – 24 October 2014

Present:-

Councillor J B Taylor Ward Member for Lytchett Matravers and P K Wharf
Chairman of the Planning Committee.

Officers in attendance B Downton, General Manager – Planning and Community
Services; T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer and S Leonard, Principal Planning
Officer.

Consideration of planning application:

The Principal Planning Officer presented the application to erect a detached 3
bedroomed chalet dwelling and form new vehicular access from Foxhills Crescent.
The site formed part of the garden of 10 Huntick Estate that was a semi detached 2-
storey house. She explained that this application followed an earlier refused scheme
on the site and explained the difference between the two proposals.

The meeting was informed that the site lay within the character area described as
'Council House Development' in the adopted Purbeck District Townscape Character
Appraisal for Lytchett Matravers and was described as a quiet residential area,
whose characteristics included semi detached houses with brick walls and tiled
roofs; low density and a regular pattern of development.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the principle of the development was
acceptable and that the dwelling was designed so as not to adversely impact on any
neighbouring amenity. There were no highway objections to the proposal. The only
issue of concern related to the design of the development.

Officers considered that the proposed dwelling with its pitched roof chalet style was
not in keeping with the predominant building design of the immediate locality of the
'Council House Development' in terms of both the proposed materials to be used
and the building style. In relation to the surrounding pattern of development, the
layout of the proposal did not meet the recommendations of the National Planning
Policy Framework guidelines that were stronger than the previous government
guidance in terms of promoting good design.

A previous planning application had been refused in July 2014 due to concerns with
the design, it was considered that the design would have had a harmful impact on
the character and amenity of the local area.

DCC Highways Authority had not raised any objection to the application. A petition
had been signed by 16 local residents from Foxhills Crescent objecting to the
application on the grounds of highway safety and the loss of on-road parking spaces.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the current application would be
recommended for refusal due to the strong National Planning Policy Framework

emphasis on good design and the adopted townscape character appraisal. The new application had some changes to the design but officers considered that the changes had not overcome the previous reasons for refusal.

The Ward Member for Lytchett Matravers informed the meeting that the Parish Council had received a petition from the residents of Foxhills Crescent and had requested that he have a meeting to discuss the application and request that it be considered by the Planning Committee due to finely balanced issues. It was noted that access to the site would be via a road that had not been adopted by the local authority. The impact on the character of the local area was an important consideration and he referred to other developments within the vicinity of the site that gave weight to supporting the application. It had been considered that the proposed site would be cramped and that the footprint was lower than the surrounding developments.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the meeting that these other developments were either not within the 'Council House Development' area or had been built before the approval of the Townscape Character Appraisal.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee noted that the application had not been acceptable to officers and that the DCC Highways Authority had not objected to the application. The impact on the character of the area should be considered. He believed that the arguments were finely balanced, partly because the proposed development is in an area on the edge of two different and distinct character area types. He felt that clear arguments existed on both sides. Therefore he decided that the application would be referred to the Planning Committee for consideration.

The meeting ended at 11.05am

Planning Application No 6/2016/0675

Priest Road (11) Swanage Dorset BH19 2RG

Council Chamber Wednesday 22 February 2017 at 12.00pm

Present:-

Councillor P K Wharf Chair of the Planning Committee, and Councillor T J Morris, Ward Member for Swanage South Ward and Councillor S S Trite, Ward Member for Swanage North Ward.

Officers in attendance: A Davies, Development Manager; T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer and S Boyt, Principal Planning Officer.

Councillors Morris and Trite had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2016/0675 be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Planning Officer explained that the application was for the erection of a detached garage with car parking area at the front of the property. The site of the application was on the southern side of Priest Road with ground levels rising from the north side. The applicant proposed to lower the ground level by half a metre, lower than the existing ground level and construct the proposed garage with a shallow pitched gable roof. The Planning Officer considered that the size, design and position of the proposed garage would not appear prominent or obtrusive in views along Priest Road. It was further considered that the proposed building would not have an adverse impact on the appearance and character of the surrounding area.

It was noted that buildings on the northern side of the Priest Road abut the edge of the road creating a sense of enclosure as opposed to the southern side of Priest Road where the ground levels were higher. Some properties on the southern side of Priests Road had off road parking and two properties had garages in the front

gardens. The proposed application was not considered to be harmful to the amenities of neighbouring properties as the ground level was lower than the neighbouring property at number 9 in addition, a condition would be imposed to prevent the installation of any windows to protect neighbour amenity. There were concerns from residents of neighbouring properties that the garage could be utilised as living accommodation. The officer informed Members that the proposed height from floor to ceiling was 2.4 metres and the ridge height was 4.0 metres. The space was considered to be appropriate for storage purposes, with no real opportunity to create a room in the roof space for habitable accommodation.

Councillors Morris and Trite outlined the concerns of the local community and expressed concern that the scale and design was out of keeping with the street scene. The height of the garage would reach the height of the window sill at 9 Priest Road and further concern was raised with the volume of the proposed garage.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee informed the meeting that he would undertake a site visit on a day and time to be confirmed. He would consider the issues regarding the volume, position and context on the street scene and report his findings in due course.

The meeting ended at 12.24pm.

The Chairman visited the site on 15th March. After careful consideration of the planning issues and obtaining an understanding of the context, setting and spatial relationships of the house and proposed garage to their neighbours properties, gardens and garages, he was of the view that the planning related issues were such that it did not warrant the decision on the application being referred to the full Planning Committee of the District Council for determination.

Planning Application No 6/2016/0653

Land off Ropers Lane, Upton BH16.

Meeting room 2 Tuesday 17 January 2017 at 4.00pm

Present:-

Councillor P K Wharf Chair of the Planning Committee and Councillor F Drane, Ward Member for Lytchett Minster and Upton East.

Officers in attendance: A Davies, Development Manager; T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer and A Bird, Principal Planning Officer.

Councillor Drane had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2016/00653- Land off Ropers Lane, Upton be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Planning Officer explained that the application was for the erection of four bungalows on land currently utilised as a garden. The main issue was access to the proposed development being a narrow un-adopted lane between No 8 and 9 Ropers Lane. It was noted that the lane was 3.5 metres wide and that the legal minimum was 3 meters wide. The developer proposed to construct a 2 meter high purpose designed acoustic fence either side of the lane in order to protect the occupiers of No 8 and 9 Ropers Lane from any noise that additional traffic from the development, may create. Following questions raised by the Councillors, Officers informed the meeting that the developer also proposed to install sprinkler systems in the homes in-case of a fire in the properties and refuse collections would be arranged through a private collection service, both arrangements would mitigate the need for large vehicles to access the properties.

The Highways Authority had not raised any safety concerns with the development and Officers did not consider that there would be any adverse effect on neighbour

amenity or character of the area. It was considered that there were no planning reasons for the application to be refused.

Councillor Drane explained that the residents of No 8 and 9 Ropers Lane were very concerned with the impact on their lives from the additional traffic that would be generated. The development was cramped, overdeveloped and would have a negative impact on the lives of the residents.

The Chairman of Planning Committee identified with the issues raised by residents of the neighbouring properties and acknowledged the concerns of Councillor Drane. He considered that the development was unattractive and cramped whilst acknowledging that there were no planning reasons to refuse the application. After careful consideration, the Chairman decided he would not be referring the application to the Planning Committee for the following reasons:

- The Highway Authority did not raise any objections to the development;
- Similar schemes in the neighbourhood had been illustrated; and.
- There were no planning reasons to refuse the application.

Meeting ended at 16.47pm.

**Planning Application No 6/2016/0667 – Briantspuddle, 32,
Dorchester DT2 7HT**

Meeting room 1, Tuesday 13 December 2016 at 10.00am.

Present:-Councillor Peter Wharf, Chairman of the Planning Committee and Councillor Laura Miller, Councillor for Wool Ward.

Officers in attendance: Jonathan Maidman, Senior Planning Officer; A Davies, Development Manager and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Miller had requested a meeting with the Chairman of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2016/0667 be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the site of the application had been subject to an approved application in May 2015 and was the subject of much pre-application discussions to enable the submitted scheme to be supported by officers. A new application had been received without any pre-application discussions. Officers felt they could not support the current scheme. They considered that the issues of concern were the proposed flat roofed extension, the height and alignment of the extension that did not align with the eaves of the existing building, and reducing the gap between the side of the development and neighbouring listed property. This resulted in a negative visual impact on the setting of the existing adjacent listed building and conservation area.

A character assessment had been carried out by the Design and Conservation Officer who stated that, adjacent to the site of the application was a listed building recorded as the oldest residential property in the village. The proposed development would have a negative impact upon the setting of the listed building, its visual appeal and distinctive architecture. The statutory duty before any decision maker on such proposals is whether they preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the adjacent listed building.

In response to questions raised by Councillor Miller, the Senior Planning Officer explained that although the approved application had a higher roof that the applicant planned to utilise as living space, the applicant now intended to extend the flat roofed extension. The issues were the height of the proposed extensions roof being higher than the eaves height of the existing building and harming the setting of the adjacent listed building. Compounding these issues, the scale, bulk and detailed design of the development would be negative in the conservation area and would have a harmful impact when approaching the village.

The Chairman suggested that the applicant be recommended to consider pre-application discussion with officers to enable a solution to be found. He did not feel

that the issues surrounding the determination of the application should be referred to the planning committee for determination.

Meeting closed at 10.35am

**Planning Application No 6/2016/0493 – Dacombe Close (Land
between 8-12), Upton BH16 5JR**

Meeting room 1, Tuesday 1 November 2016 at 2.00pm.

Present:-Councillor Peter Wharf, Chairman of the Planning Committee and
Councillor Fred Drane District Councillor for Lytchett Minster and Upton East Ward.

Officers in attendance: Jonathan Maidman, Senior Planning Officer; A Davies,
Development Manager and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Drane had requested a meeting with the Chairman of the Planning
Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that
planning application no 6/2016/0493 be referred to the Planning Committee for
determination.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the application was for a development
consisting of a pair of 3 bedroomed semi-detached houses with associated surface
parking, amenity space and new access onto Dacombe Close.

The site was triangular in shape located in the centre of Upton and had been subject
to a number of previous applications. Located in the settlement boundary within the
400 metre zone of protected Heathland; the applicant had been advised to consult
with Natural England regarding the proposals to ascertain if there was any objection
to the development that at the time was in the process of reviewing the consultation
zone around the Upton Heath. Natural England have confirmed that due to the
location of the development and the dual carriageway they raise no objection.
Officers advised they would support the application as there would be no harm to the
prevailing character and appearance of the area and that no harmful impact to
neighbour amenity would occur. The first floor side elevations of the proposed
dwellings would not have windows fitted to prevent overlooking.

No objection had been raised by the highway authority or the Town Council.
Neighbour concerns had been raised with the lack of local infrastructure in the area
especially with regard to schools.

The rear of the site contained a former petrol station, a condition would require a
land contamination survey to be carried out and a sustainable drainage system to be
agreed. Double yellow lines were in the front of the site to prevent on road parking.

Chairman gave careful consideration to the issues and considered that there was
insufficient reason to refer the application to the Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 2.22pm.

**Planning Application No 6/2016/0099-
60 Poole Road, Upton BH16 5JD.**

Meeting room 3 Monday 11 April 2016 at 11.24am

Present:-

Councillor P K Wharf Chair of the Planning Committee and Councillor F Drane, Ward Member for Lytchett Minster and Upton East.

Officers in attendance: A Davies, Development Manager; T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer and J Maidman, Senior Planning Officer.

Councillor Drane had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2016/0099- 60 Poole Road, Upton be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Planning Officer explained that the application was for a two storey and single storey rear extensions, two storey side extension and a single storey front extension to convert an existing dwelling into two dwellings and the erection of a workshop in the rear garden.

The application was within the existing settlement boundary of Upton. The property had been subject to a previous planning application that had been refused due to the impact to the ground floor living area at the neighbouring property. The Senior Planning Officer considered that following changes that had been made to the original plans, the reason for refusal of the application had been overcome.

Councillor Drane explained that the resident of the neighbouring property had objected to the application stating that the rear extension would be oppressive, over bearing and would result in a loss of light to her ground floor living space and, that the thin internal walls would be a noise nuisance. The application if approved would be out of keeping with the area. It was noted that Upton Town Council had objected

to the application and recommended refusal. Further concern was raised with regard to the proposed workshop and an increase in noise that may be generated and with its proposed use.

The Development Manager explained that the applicant had offered to install sound proofing in the internal walls between the neighbouring property and the proposed development but given the existing internal layout of the property, it was not possible to require sound proofing by a planning condition. The original plans had been changed to address the concerns raised by the neighbours with regard to the rear extension. It had been moved further back to allow more light into the living space of the neighbouring property. It was noted that the proposed workshop was to be used in association with the house and that it could have been constructed by the use of permitted development.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee identified with the issues raised by resident of the neighbouring property and acknowledged the concerns of Councillor Drane. It was agreed that the application would not be referred to the Planning Committee. Officers would request that the applicant honour his agreement to install sound proofing between the proposed development and the neighbouring walls, to prevent noise nuisance.

Meeting ended at 12 25pm.

**Planning Application No 6/2015/0497 – 25 Monmouth Road,
Wareham, BH20 4QF**

Meeting room 1 Friday 9 October 2015 @ 2.30pm

Present:-

Councillor Peter Wharf, Chairman of the Planning Committee and Councillor Hillary Goodinge, District Councillor for Wareham Ward.

Officers in attendance: A Bird, Principal Planning Officer; A Davies, Development Manager and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Goodinge had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2015/0497 be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the application was for a single storey side and rear extension to the existing bungalow. The site had been subject to three previous applications and subsequent appeals that had been dismissed by the planning inspector, principally on the grounds that the extension would appear overly dominant in the street scene and be detrimentally harmful to the character of the area.

Pre application advice had been given prior to this application in which officers had confirmed the need for the proposed extension to integrate with the existing dwelling.

The applicant's personal circumstances were acknowledged; officers disagreed with the amount of space that the applicant considered that he needed, if approved the adverse impact on the area would remain beyond his personal circumstances. The principal of the development could be supported providing it did not adversely impact on the area. Officers were further concerned that the extension was effectively a self contained unit that included a kitchen/dining room and a bedroom.

Councillor Goodinge referred to the site, where she considered that the neighbouring properties were very close together therefore, she did not believe that the development would detract from the spaciousness of the area; stating that there was a hospital/surgery opposite the site. The applicant was disabled and therefore deserved special consideration. In response to officers concerns regarding the width of the proposed hallway and porch; she explained that the width was considered by the applicant to be necessary for wheelchair access.

The Chairman considered that the application was similar to those that had been refused by the planning inspector with no significant changes; Pre-application advice

had not been taken up. Therefore he would not be referring the application to the Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 3.15pm.

**Planning Application No 6/2015/0379- Hambury Bottom, Lulworth
Cove, BH20 5RS**

Meeting room 3 Tuesday 18 August 2015 @ 9.30am

Present:-

Councillor Peter Wharf Chairman of the Planning Committee and Councillor Barry Quinn, District Member for Lulworth and Winfrith.

Officers in attendance: Anthony Bird, Principal Planning Officer; Alan Davies, Development Manager and Tina Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Quinn had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2015/0359- Hambury Bottom, Lulworth Cove, BH20 5RS be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the application was for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a replacement dwelling with a detached garage, an underground swimming pool, re-profile and re-landscape the grounds. The site was located outside of the settlement boundary of West Lulworth within the AONB and West Lulworth Conservation Area.

In consideration of the application, officers referred to the Planning Act, and Listed Building and Conservation Areas guidance in regard to the preserving and / or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The Council's Design and Conservation Officer considered that the existing building made a positive contribution to the conservation area, and the new build would sustain the positive contribution.

With reference to concerns raised by some members of the community regarding land stability, officers stated that it was thought that any erosion of the land would not effect the property for another 100 years.

Councillor Quinn raised the following issues:

- the size of the development in the AONB and Lulworth Conservation Area was considered to be disproportionate;
- that the internal plans did not match the external plans; and
- Lulworth did not have street lighting and many residents appreciated the dark skies. Concern was raised that if the application was approved, the lighting would effect the night skies.

In the interests of transparency and as part of the reason for referral, Councillor Quinn referred to a comment made by the local community that the agent had addressed the case officer by his first name in an email which suggested a 'cosy relationship'.

It was acknowledged that the size of the development had increased significantly, however, officers felt it would not have a negative impact on the Conservation Area. The internal second floor drawings did not match the external plans, however, officers were aware of this, and would exclude this plan from the planning permission. The lack of windows in the second floor was noted. The Design and Conservation Officer had recommended a planning condition to control roof lights. Officers would impose a condition removing permitted development rights for roof lights, so that if these were proposed, they would have to be the subject of a planning application for consideration. No external lighting had been proposed by the applicant.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee considered that concerns regarding the size of the application were unfounded and considered the proposals were not disproportionate. The roof lights would be controlled by a planning condition, for

those reasons, he would not refer the application to the Planning Committee for determination.

He further thanked the Parish Council for their recognition of the sensitive area and acknowledged the concerns that had been raised. It was recommended that Purbeck Local Plan Partial Review Advisory Group consider a policy regarding the control of lighting in the district.

With regard to what was conceived as familiarity from the applicant's agent to the Planning Officer in his email; it was stated that any informal greeting to officers is at the choice of the agent, and not to be viewed as a reflection on officers' professionalism.

Meeting ended at 10.25am

**Planning Application No 6/2015/0167- Lighthouse Road (22)
Swanage, BH19 2JJ**

Meeting held on Thursday 29 July 2015 at 3.15pm in Meeting Room 1

Present:-

Councillor Peter Wharf Chairman of the Planning Committee and Councillors Gary Suttle and Bill Trite.

Officers in attendance: A Davies, Development Manager; Ros Drane, Planning Officer and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Suttle and Councillor Trite had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2015/0167- 22 Lighthouse Road, Swanage be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Planning Officer outlined the application to insert a dormer window, the installation of roof lights and a Juliette balcony to extend the first floor accommodation, the erection of a two-storey rear extension and a replacement porch. The application was considered to be acceptable with no demonstrable harm to neighbouring properties, subject to planning conditions. She explained that the applicant had taken into account concerns from neighbours regarding the northern side of the property and as a result the width of the north facing extension had been reduced. The applicant had no objection to a condition requiring the installation of obscured glass on the north side of the extension to be fixed shut and the installation of dormer windows to the kitchen/dining room windows to the south. Representation had been received from Swanage Town Council who recommended refusal of the application as it was considered to be a gross overdevelopment and out of keeping with the street scene. Further concerns were raised with regard to overshadowing and loss of light to neighbouring properties. Representation had been received from neighbours citing excessive height in scale and impact on the AONB, proximity to neighbouring boundaries, loss of privacy and natural light and overshadowing.

Following concerns raised by Councillor Suttle and Councillor Trite, concerns were addressed with regard to land levels, distance to the boundary of neighbouring properties, natural light and the existing outlook. The rise and fall of the sunset was illustrated. It was noted that no restrictions existed with regard to distances to boundary fencing that properties could be built to. A fence of up to 2 metres could be erected on the side boundary without the need for planning permission. Other properties within the neighbourhood were considered to be very similar in size and design to the proposed application. The development was not considered to be harmful and would not have a demonstrable impact on the countryside of the AONB.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee carefully considered the application and concluded that no demonstrable harm would occur to neighbouring amenity. Therefore, he would not refer the application to the Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 3.50pm.

**Planning Application No 6/2015/0276- Panorama Road – Swanage
Bay View Holiday Park, Swanage, BH19 2QS**

Meeting room 1 Monday 4 June 2015 @ 9.00am

Present:-

Councillor P K Wharf Chair of the Planning Committee

Officers in attendance: Steve Boyt, Principal Planning Officer; Alan Davies, Development Manager and Tina Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Suttle had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to consider a request that planning application no 6/2015/0276 – Swanage Bay View Holiday Park, Swanage be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the application was for retrospective permission to erect an entrance barrier to the holiday park and engineering works relating to Plot 226A including the erection of a retaining wall and fencing.

The site was outside of the settlement boundary and inside the AONB. Officers considered that the application would not be prominent or harmful and would not impact on the amenity of the AONB.

Concerns had been raised by an occupant of the site stating that:

- they found it difficult to enter the security code to raise the barriers without leaving their cars. To enter the code without leaving their car it was considered to be likely that damage to their car on the boulders that have been positioned around the barriers would occur;
- it was difficult to enter the security code at night time because the keypad was not illuminated; and
- people with a disability were finding it difficult to use the barriers to enter the Park.

Officers reported that the barrier access was the concern of the park operator and not a planning consideration, however, correspondence was sent to the applicants agent suggesting that the park owner be encouraged to take the occupants observations into account and, consider whether the design of the barriers could be modified to make them easier to use for all of the Park's occupants and that the modifications could be incorporated in the planning application.

A response was received from the applicant's agent stating that consideration was being given to installing an automatic number plate reader. A temporary solar light was in place to illuminate the keypad whilst the installation of an illuminated keypad was installed.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee gave the request careful consideration, but noted that as the issues relating to access were more for the site owners to resolve, and the fact that there would be no significant harm or impact on the environment, he did not feel it was an application that should be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

Meeting ended at 9.20am

Planning Application No 6/2015/0191- Castle Farm Road (Castle Farm Retirement Home), Lytchett Matravers, BH16 6BZ

Meeting room 3 Monday 11 May 2015 @ 2.00pm

Present:-

Councillor P K Wharf Chair of the Planning Committee

Officers in attendance: A Davies, Development Manager; Jonathon Maidman, Planning Officer and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Former Councillor Taylor had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2015/0191- Castle Farm Retirement Home be referred to the Planning Committee for determination because he felt that the green belt issues should be considered by councillors.

The Planning Officer explained that the proposal was to erect a single storey extension with a total footprint of 54.5 square metres. 49.6 square metres for the two en-suite bedrooms and 4.9 square metres for the lobby. The building was originally a barn that had been granted planning permission in August 1969 to allow for a conversion into an agricultural worker's dwelling. Relief from a condition was granted in 1984 to allow for an extension to the building and a further application in 1986 allowed a change of use from a domestic residence to a private nursing home. Many additions had been made to the original building and officers considered that the building had altered and extended to such an extent that the original building was now unrecognisable.

Officers considered that the application if approved would become disproportionate in the green belt and its cumulative impact would take it above the NPPF guidelines. They also considered that the application did not qualify for "the very special circumstances" outlined in paragraph 87 of the NPPF.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee decided to consider the matter further until the next day when he informed officers that he does not believe that the matter should be referred to Planning Committee. He does not believe that every planning application to do with the green belt should be referred to Planning Committee and he did not believe that this application contained any matters of wider implications to the District.

Meeting ended at 2.30pm

**Planning Application No 6/2014/0286 – R/O 55 West Street, Corfe
Castle**

Meeting room 1 – 25 July 2014

Present:-

Councillor N Dragon Ward Councillor for Castle (Corfe Castle and Studland) and P Wharf Chairman of the Planning Committee.

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting: A Bird, Principal Planning Officer; A Davies, Development Manager and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Consideration of planning applications:

Councillor Dragon had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request a review of planning application no 6/2014/0286. Arising from the meeting, the following matters were addressed:

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the proposal was for full planning permission to erect a detached 3 bedroomed dwelling with garage to the rear of 55 West Street, Corfe Castle. The site lay within the settlement boundary of Corfe Castle defined as a key service village under the Local Plan Policy LD, within the designated Conservation Area and AONB. Vehicular access was at the south western corner of the site via an unmade road onto West Street. Planning history had shown that the site originally formed part of an area on which outline planning permission to erect 5 dwellings was granted in 1060, four had subsequently been built. Planning permission at that time was not time limited but a change in the Planning Act in 1968 imposed retrospective time limits. In 1999 and again in 2004 permission was granted for one dwelling, since 2009 the site had been without planning permission.

Members noted that ground levels of the site was 2.5 metres (lowest) and 3.8 metres (highest) with the proposed ground floor level of the building being at 3.28 metres compared to the application datum point of 2.45 metres (a drain cover located in the access road). Officers gave assurances that this was an identifiable datum point external to the development site that would enable appropriate checks to be made to ensure the building was built at the correct height.

Reference was made to the 2004 outline planning permission which contained a condition requiring the dwelling to be single storey only. The reason for this was stated to be in the interests of preserving the amenity of neighbouring dwellings. The distance between the proposed dwelling and the nearest neighbouring dwellings at No 55 and Kerilee was 24 metres. Although the new dwelling will have a greater overall height than those neighbouring dwellings, the separation distance would be

sufficient to ensure that it will not dominate neighbours or result in unacceptable overshadowing of any neighbouring property. The adopted design guide stated that minimum recommended distance between buildings on similar levels with facing windows was 21 metres to overlooking. No windows are proposed within the side elevation of the new dwelling facing towards the rear of 55. The proposed front elevation faces towards the front elevation of Kerilee, but at a distance of at least 24 metres. So there was no unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring dwellings.

Officers had held discussions with the applicant in order to reach a satisfactory arrangement for minimising flood risk. Surface water drainage was to be channelled via a swale and control mechanism that would link into a drain on West Street.

The new property would be visible from the open countryside immediately to the east and so indigenous hedgerow planting was being proposed along the south and east boundaries to soften the impact of the development. Together with existing planting, this should ensure that the building will not be intrusive in views from the 'notable open green space' further to the east.

Officers pointed out that the conservation area appraisal identifies both No 55 and Kerilee as having a 'negative' impact on the conservation area. Consequently it was considered that it would be wrong to repeat the form and detailed design of those buildings on the application site. The overall scale of the proposed building was not considered to be excessive and due to it being centrally located within the plot and with a relatively low building density, the spacious character of the immediate area would not be adversely affected. The design was considered to be appropriate and would compliment the wider character of the conservation area.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee noted that there would be no significant harm or impact on the environment or the wider district of Purbeck; therefore he would not be referring the application to the Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 12.15pm

**Planning Application No 6/2014/0281- St James Cottage, Worth
Matravers, BH19 3LW.**

Meeting room 1 Monday 14 May 2014 @ 4.00pm

Present:-

Councillor P K Wharf Chair of the Planning Committee and Councillor M W J Lovell District Councillor for Langton (Langton Matravers and Worth Matravers).

Officers in attendance: A Davies, Development Manager; R Drane, Planning Officer and T Dudley, Democratic Services Officer.

Councillor Lovell had requested a meeting with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Development Manager and the case officer in order to request that planning application no 6/2014/0281- St James Cottage, Worth Matravers be referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Planning Officer explained that the proposal was an application to erect an outbuilding to be used for garden storage, which would be positioned alongside the south west boundary with Winspit Road. The application had been delegated to officers because it was felt to be within the scheme of delegation. Members were shown the plans and photographs of the site including the surrounding area and the views from neighbouring properties. Members' attention was drawn to the elevation and landscaping surrounding the property of the applicant and that of the neighbouring properties. The Planning Officer reported that:

- there was no objection in principal to the development;
- the positioning, scale, design and impact on the character and appearance of the area including the natural and scenic beauty of the wider countryside designated Dorset area of outstanding natural beauty did not cause harm; and
- it was considered that the application did not impact on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Members raised concerns that the application might be unlawful due to its location outside the settlement boundary and that the scale, size and the impact on neighbouring properties might not be desirable. Clarification was sought to the actual size of the proposed building.

The Planning Officer informed Members that the main part of the lawful residential curtilage of the garden of St James Cottage extended approximately 110 metres south of the house. The settlement boundary was defined in the Purbeck Local Plan and cut through the garden approximately 8 metres from the rear of the house. The proposed garden store would be located in the south west corner of the garden but beyond the line of the settlement boundary. The Purbeck Local Plan stated that land outside of the settlement boundary was countryside and that the countryside policy – CO did not prohibit the erection of a small scale outbuilding within the garden of an existing residential property. The proposed application had been judged against the impact on the landscape and officers considered that it would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, visually, ecologically, or from traffic movements.

Officers acknowledged that the proposed building would change the private views of the neighbouring properties. The distance from a neighbouring house overlooking the proposed site to the boundary wall was approximately 8 metres. An existing low Purbeck stone boundary wall and hedging would in part screen the rear of the new building from the view of the nearest neighbouring property, Wayside. However due to distance, intervening boundary treatments and scale of the proposed building the development was felt not be dominating or oppressive.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee noted that there would be no significant harm or impact on the environment or the wider district of Purbeck; therefore he

would not be referring the application to the Planning Committee. Whilst accepting there was no planning justification for the request the Chairman asked that a request be made to the applicant to relocate the proposed application a few metres nearer to the original garden of the property where its location would be less visible from the neighbouring property of Wayside, this would be in the interest of good neighbour relations.

He also requested that a condition be imposed on any approval, controlling the materials being used on the application and that the agreed materials be strictly adhered to, those materials being timber clad walls with a pitched roof finished in cedar shingles.

Meeting ended at 16.55pm