



Northern Area Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, 9 December 2025
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: Stour Hall - The Exchange, Old Market Hill, Sturminster Newton, DT10 1FH

Members (Quorum: 6)

Richard Crabb (Chair), David Taylor (Vice-Chair), Alex Brenton, Barrie Cooper, Les Fry, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout, James Vitali and Carl Woode

Chief Executive: Catherine Howe, County Hall, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 1XJ

For more information about this agenda please contact Democratic & Governance Services Meeting Contact 01305 224877 - john.miles@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting, apart from any items listed in the exempt part of this agenda. If you would like to attend this meeting and have any specific requirements please contact the Democratic Services Officer named above.

For easy access to all the council's committee agendas and minutes download the free public app called Modern.Gov for use on any iPad, Android, and Windows tablet. Once downloaded select Dorset Council.

Agenda

Item		Pages
8.	NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES 14TH AND 28TH OCTOBER TO BE APPROVED.	3 - 42

This page is intentionally left blank



NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 14 OCTOBER 2025

Present: Cllrs Richard Crabb (Chair), Alex Brenton, Barrie Cooper, Les Fry, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout, James Vitali and Carl Woode

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)), Louis Wicks (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice), Susan Hetherington (Engineer (Development Liaison)), Claire Lewis (Planning Officer), Pete Markham and Jennie Roberts (Senior Planning Officer).

84. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs David Taylor and Sherry Jespersen.

85. Election of Vice Chair

Proposed by Cllr Vitali, seconded by Cllr Belinda Ridout.

Cllr Cooper elected Vice Chair for the duration of the meeting.

86. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made at the meeting.

87. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 8th July 2025 were confirmed and signed.

88. Registration for public speaking and statements

Representations by the public to the Committee on individual planning applications are detailed below. There were no questions, petitions or deputations received on other items on this occasion.

89. P/FUL/2025/03818, Blandford St Mary C Of E Va Primary School Birch Avenue Blandford St Mary DT11 9QD.

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. The application was for a single storey extension and to demolish a building on site. The existing temporary mobile classroom, now used

by Little Birch Pre-school was granted temporary permission in 1997 and later extended at the front and side. The proposed site was contained in the existing development where it had been considered to be sufficient space to allow further extension to the main building. There were no relevant planning constraints for the development, and the application had been brought to the Committee due to Tenure of the land of which the modular pre-school building had been erected. A sheltered structure had been added to the rear of the pre-school building on land owned by Dorset Council. Therefore, any structure built or demolished on Dorset Council owned land must be considered at the Planning Committee. It was officers' opinion that the proposal offered efficient use of the space, in a moderate sized extension, that ensured no net loss of playground space and far greater energy efficiency. There would be no increased risk of flooding to the site and no demonstrable risk to highway safety and no changes to existing access or parking arrangements.

There was no Public Participation.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Cooper commented that the application was in his ward and that it would be a good improvement and he agreed with the proposal.**

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr Carole Jones.

Decision: To grant planning permission subject to conditions set out in the appendix of the minutes.

90. **P/FUL/2024/06927, Land South of Bolney, Salisbury Road, Blandford Forum DT11 7SP.**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. Photographs of location plan, and the access arrangement going north of the local centre of Blandford forum local parklands development was shown. The application was to erect 33 dwellings with garages and parking and form a vehicle access from Salisbury Road, associated infrastructure and public open space. The proposal was an extension of the 490 houses that had been previously approved. None of the trees that were due to be removed were above category c and low grade and would be replaced. An update sheet of minor tweaks modifying condition 15 and adding two conditions in consultation with ecologists and Dorset natural environment team was shown to the Committee. Highways recommended a conditional approval.

Public Participation

Martin Richley spoke against the application and informed that he was a pragmatist, as soon as the land was sold to the developer, he was sure that something would be built here. He and many of the local neighbours, were hoping

for a development more in line with the two houses either side of the site entrance, or possibly a development along the lines of a community house trust of homes for local people, rather than what was currently proposed. He produced a letter of objection to the current proposal, based on what he believe were reasonable grounds, however, he felt that the objections/comments were not worth the paper they were written on, as they seemed to be ignored by the system, especially as there were rarely, if any, feedback or changes made based on the objections/comments. He requested that the committee, as they consider the application, to reflect on two things. When this plot of land was sold, a mature orchard of some 30 trees, plus hedging and other mature trees were grubbed out over a weekend, before an emergency tree preservation order was obtained. He asked if the promised planting regime of this application would replace not only the trees and shrubs that will need to be removed for this development, but also take into account the orchard and other trees that were cut down before this application was submitted and how this would be monitored and enforced? Secondly, he believed that it was both the governments and this council's aim to produce integrated housing developments. The layout of this site had all the social and affordable housing sited together at the entrance, close to the main road, while all the commercial housing was set at the back of the development? This was not integration, but segregation, therefore should the current design layout be amended to provide an integrated development?

Tim Hoskinton Director of Wyatt Homes

Mr Hoskinton informed that Wyatt Homes was a Dorset based house builder with a track record of delivering high quality community purpose developments which stand the test of time. He was proud of the places that Wyatt homes create and was committed to building well designed homes using locally based trading contractors. He gave an update on the wider application. The detailed design works was progressing well and the 278 agreements with Dorset Council was expected to be completed within the next few months. He was also working on the discharge of conditions applications. He anticipated that the development would commence on the first phase of the wider site by next year. The application today was not included in the original application for the wider site as it was not in Wyatt Homes control at that time but have worked hard to secure it and pleased to bring this application forward. He underlined the importance of the site, to the overall masterplan, and he went over a number of benefits such as, it would allow the main tree line of avenue that runs through the centre of the wider site to connect to Salisbury Road and the local centre beyond. This would improve pedestrian and cycle ways and vehicle connectivity throughout the site. It would also allow a better route for buses going through the primary street of the main development which would extend through the application site new roundabout from Salisbury Road. The provision of the new roundabout would improve access to the local centre and the new allotments. It would also create an attractive and welcoming frontage, and the layout follows the approved design principles of the neighbouring scheme, generous landscaping, street trees and central green areas. The design will integrate seamlessly with the wider scheme using carefully selected materials and retain a few landscaping features along with new planting to assimilate the developments into the surroundings. The proposal will not affect Pimperne setting or separation from Blandford. The gap between settlements is primarily north to northeast and not in the application area. Homes would be 2 storeys with a variety

of types and sizes ranging from one-bedroom apartments to 500 homes. The development would include 30% affordable housing fully integrated with section 106 contributions in line with the wider site. All homes built to high standards of energy efficiency and will incorporate heat pumps, thermal installation, energy efficient appliances, which will reduce running costs.

Cllr Cross the Chair of Blandford Forum Town Council's Planning Committee spoke in favour of the application. He explained that the application had to be endorsed by the Blandford + Neighbourhood Group. He was impressed by the comments and plaudits given by the Committee when passing the original application 12 months ago when it was described as 'the most informed and exceptional scheme'. He noted also that all the attributes of that scheme are included in this application and that was favourably received by the Planning Officer in charge. He accepted that most of the land involved here was within Pimperne but noted that Dorset puts greater weight behind development around the 4 hub towns in the North Dorset area which included Blandford Forum. Any neutral observer would see that the Letton area as a whole could be seen as the entrance to the urban area of Blandford Forum. He was pleased to see all the eco-friendly attributes incorporated into these 33 properties such as the E.V. charging points and P.V.cell rooves etc. and all the attention to bats and bird boxes to aid the environment. Not to mention the total replacement of 13 low-quality tree to be replaced by sturdy new trees and shrubs leading to the original Parklands development. In addition, he noted that the Blandford + Code of Design had been adhered to. The new Dorset APS to be fixed from 31st Oct was expected to show a Land Supply of only 2.7% i.e. a shortage of some 8000 houses. He did not believe the cries of "foul" from Pimperne hold water and were behind the tide of events which could have avoided by joining the Blandford + Group at the beginning. But they refused to go it alone.

Cllr Slocombe Chairman Pimperne Parish Council. He explained that the application site was not in Blandford Forum, it was in the Parish of Pimperne which sits in Cranborne Chase. The proposed section 106 requires amendment to record Pimperne as the local parish. This was another application by Wyatt homes that goes against Pimperne neighbourhood plan which was updated as recently as October 2022 after a thorough review. It conflicts with our plan on many points. Pimperne neighbourhood Plan more than meets the requirement for housing in our area, so there is clear conflict with our MCN and Policy SB. The addition of a new roundabout so close to the bypass intended to connect the larger site has not been properly modelled and underestimates the impacts. The impact of two junctions in close proximity plus a late-night parking for the centre, plus a bus stop in the road, plus pedestrian crossing points on the roundabout would cause immense driver frustration. He explained that this was a recipe for accidents, exactly where we expect our children to cross the road. It was hindering rather than prioritising pedestrian journeys and air quality would be detrimentally affected by increased traffic congestion. Putting yet more houses in the gap than exists in the south, area of unique character and diminishes the semi-rural nature of its setting. Against the very intent of our policy LC and in conflict with our policy LDC. The Pimperne neighbourhood plan requires 40% not 30% of the total dwellings to be provided as affordable houses and our neighbourhood plan should not be seen as an optional requirement.

Cllr Jespersen submitted a statement as ward member.

Statement from Cllr Sherry Jespersen, Ward Member for Hill Forts and Upper Tarrants

May I remind committee members that this application is located in the parish of Pimperne, not in Blandford.

And that currently we are meeting our 5 Year Housing Land Supply, so the Tilted Balance does not apply; our policies therefore carry full weight.

There are, in my view, grounds on which you could refuse this application should you so wish.

1. The application is outside of the settlement boundary so it is in the countryside where the North Dorset Local Plan requires that development should be resisted.

2. The application also conflicts with Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan which designates this area as an Important Gap protecting the setting between the village and the town of Blandford. The Neighbourhood Plan is up to date and carries full weight.

3. The application is in the setting of the Cranborne Chase National Landscape and therefore the CROW Act 2000 applies. This requires Dorset Council not, as the report suggests, simply to “take account of”, but to “seek to further” the purposes of the designation. This application represents a further incursion into the farmland landscape, and the cumulative impact is relevant here.

If you are minded to permit this development, could I ask the Committee to raise two points.

1. The Section 106 funding gives nothing to Pimperne, the Parish in which the application is located. The previous application at this location allocated no S106 funding to Pimperne either. This is patently unfair.

2. The site is in a very important designated Dark Skies area. It would be wise to strengthen this condition to cover domestic lighting which could cause harm which is easily avoidable.

Members questions and comments

- Cllr Ridout asked for more details on the pedestrian links through the site and how they linked up. She asked if the proposal included swift bricks.
- Cllr Major asked about traffic calming measures
- Cllr Cooper raised concerns about traffic, if the proposal was joined up by the other 500 houses.
- Cllr Jones suggested that any tree planting would be that of fruit trees to replace the orchard.

- Cllr Fry enquired about allocating money to Pimperne and let Pimperne Parish council come up with a project to allocate money. This was not carried through into the recommendation following officer advice to the committee
- Cllr Potheary commented that Pimperne had done their very best to create a neighbourhood plan and Blandford was creating urban sprawl in their neighbourhood. She said that it was unlikely that Pimperne would receive any financial compensation and highlighted the importance of the designated gap between their village and Blandford Forum. She raised concerns with traffic and she could not support this application on the basis that it does not follow Pimperne neighbourhood plan.
- Cllr Jones commented that the application dismisses Pimperne neighbourhood plan. She commented that the countryside should be a last resort for housing and not the first. However, she knew this company were great builders in which make real estates.
- Cllr Fry commented that 490 houses were already being built outside Pimperne and this application was for 30 houses.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr Belinda Ridout.

Decision: To grant planning permission subject to the updated conditions set out in the appendix of the minutes and the completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the items listed in this report, and the adoption of a screening opinion.

91. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

92. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 - 11.53 am

Chairman

.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Northern Area Planning Committee

14th October 2025

Decision List

Application Reference: P/FUL/2025/03818.

Application Site: BLANDFORD ST MARY C OF E VA PRIMARY SCHOOL BIRCH AVENUE BLANDFORD ST MARY DT11 9QD.

Proposal: Single storey extension. (Demolish existing modular building).

Recommendation: GRANT subject to conditions.

Decision: that the application be granted subject to the following planning conditions set out below:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

4364-01 A Location/Block/Existing Plans

4364-02 A Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. The external materials to be used for the walls and roof shall be similar in colour and texture to the existing building, in accordance with the materials listed on the 'Application Form' dated 17/06/2025.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

The following informative notes are recommended.

1. Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition (biodiversity gain condition) that development may not begin unless:

(a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and

(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be Dorset Council.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are listed in full in a subsequent informative below.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

•Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

- i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and
- ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

Read more about Biodiversity Net Gain at
<https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/biodiversitynet-gain>

2. Statutory Exemptions and Transitional Arrangements in respect of the Biodiversity Gain Plan

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and

(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or

(ii) the application for the original planning permission* to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;

ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or

iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

- i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and
- ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.6 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013. * "original planning permission means the permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

3. Informative: National Planning Policy Framework Statement

In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- offering a pre-application advice service, and
- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

Decision List

Application Reference: P/FUL/2024/06927.

Application Site: Land South of Bolney, Salisbury Road, Blandford Forum DT11 7SP.

Proposal: Erect 33 No. dwellings with garages and parking. Form vehicular access from Salisbury Road, associated infrastructure and public open space. Carry out site preparation and ancillary works.

Recommendation: Grant conditional planning permission subject to the signing of a S106 legal agreement within six months of a committee resolution. If the S106 is not signed within that time period, then the application should be refused unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Head of Planning.

Decision: that the application be Granted, subject to the following updated conditions set out below, and the completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in a form to be agreed by the Legal Services manager to secure the items listed in this report.

The planning permission is subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

180_DI_03.6 Location Plan

131_DI_08.2 Block Plan

131_DI_02.19 Site Layout Plan

180_DI_05.2 Dwelling Mix Plan

131_DI_06.4 Boundary Materials Plan

A052-P-202 External Materials Plan
 Block of Flats 1 - 6 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Gla-B-AC Plot 7 Floor Plans & Elevations
 1006-HA-B-I Plots 8 - 9 Floor Plans & Elevations
 1006-HA-R-I Plots 10 - 11 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Bea-B-I Plots 12 - 13 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Lyt-BF-12-V Plots 14 & 22 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Com-B-C Plots 15 - 16 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Mor-BF-C-V Plot 17 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Pul-BF-C Plot 18 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Upw-B-I Plot 19 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Wim-B-I Plot 20 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Mar-B-I1 Plot 21 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Mor-B-I Plots 23 - 24 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Spe-BF-I Plot 25 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Pul-B-I-V Plot 26 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Bro-B-C Plot 27 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Block of Flats HA 28-33 Block of Flats 28 - 33 Floor Plans & Elevations
 DG2-B Double Garage 2-B Floor Plans & Elevations
 TrG2-B-V1 Triple Garage 2-B-V1 Floor Plans & Elevations
 TrG2-B-V2 Triple Garage 2-B-V2 Floor Plans & Elevations
 Tw-G2-B Twin Garage 2-B Floor Plans & Elevations
 23017 3 Tree Protection Plan

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, details of the following works shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- The creation for a new proposed roundabout junction connection from Salisbury Road into the development site as illustrated in Appendix A page 69 in the Transport Statement, drawing number 01-PHL-2002 Rev B (or similar scheme to be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority).

Thereafter, the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details and made available as such prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby approved.

Reason: These specified works are seen as a pre-requisite for allowing the development to proceed, providing the necessary highway infrastructure improvements to mitigate the likely impact of the proposal.

4. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shown on drawing number 180_DI_11.1 shall be constructed. Thereafter these areas shall be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

5. No works shall commence on site (other than those required by this condition) for the development hereby permitted until the first 15.00m of the proposed access road, including the junction with the existing public highway, has been completed to at least binder course level.

Reason: To ensure that a suitably surfaced and constructed access to the site is provided that prevents loose material being dragged and/or deposited onto the adjacent carriageway causing a safety hazard

6. Prior to development above damp-proof course level, a scheme to prevent the discharge of surface water from the development onto the highway(s) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby approved and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

7. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, the visibility splay areas as shown in the Transport Statement Appendix A page 70 on drawing 01-PHL-2003 Rev A must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.6 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015, or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, the visibility splay areas shall thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstruction above this height.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety.

8. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved a Construction Traffic Management Plan and programme of works shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include:

- construction vehicle details (number, size, type and frequency of movement)

- a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries
- timings of deliveries so as to avoid, where possible, peak traffic periods
- a framework for managing abnormal loads
- location of construction site access
- contractors' arrangements (compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage)
- wheel cleaning facilities
- vehicle cleaning facilities
- inspection of the highways serving the site (by the developer (or his contractor) and Dorset Highways) prior to work commencing and at regular, agreed intervals during the construction phase
- a scheme of appropriate signing of vehicle route to the site
- a route plan for all contractors and suppliers to be advised on
- temporary traffic management measures where necessary
- A sweeper will be required periodically to ensure the public highway is kept clear of loose debris that maybe transferred from the site.
- Any site entrance gate that may need to be erected, will need to be set back a minimum of 15m from the edge of the carriageway.

Thereafter, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the agreed Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

9. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and including clarification of how surface water is to be managed during construction, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is completed.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and to improve habitat and amenity

10. Prior to occupation of the development, details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These should include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

11. Prior to use or occupation of development hereby approved, a scheme showing details of the proposed cycle parking facilities shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. thereafter the approved details shall be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.

Reason: To ensure provision of adequate cycle parking to support sustainable transport; in the interests of highway safety and residential amenity.

12. Prior to occupation or use of any building hereby approved, a pedestrian and cycling signage strategy shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Amongst other details this shall include information about the town generally, employment sites and shopping destinations, signage to be erected, when, and where. Thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: in the interest of public health and safety.

13. Prior to occupation or use of any building hereby approved, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local Planning Authority. This shall include measures for each phase of the development hereby approved. The Travel Plan, as submitted, shall include:

- Targets for sustainable travel arrangements.
- Effective measures for the on-going monitoring of the Travel Plan relative to the land use.
- A commitment to delivering the Travel Plan objectives for a period of at least five years from first occupation, or use, of each phase of the development.
- Effective mechanisms to achieve the objectives of the Travel Plan by the occupiers of the development for each phase.

Thereafter, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan.

Reason: In order to reduce or mitigate the impacts of the development upon the local highway network and surrounding neighbourhood by reducing reliance on the private car for journeys to and from the site in the interest of health and

safety.

14. Prior to commencement of any works on site, details for each of the following items shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details:

- Pollution prevention protocol (i.e. the storage of pollutants in SPZ1 and the control of muddy run-off).
- Surface water management strategy during and post construction.
- Foul drainage scheme for each phase of development.
- Sewage pipe work specifications

Reason: To ensure that the proposed construction scheme and the final drainage system does not harm groundwater resources in line with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

15. Prior to commencement of any works on site a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP should address public amenities such as air quality, noise pollution, and potentially unforeseen contamination as well as the following items:

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities to public amenities such as water and air quality, noise, and land contamination.
- b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

Thereafter, development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed CEMP.

Reason: in the interest of public health and safety.

16. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the recommendations and requirements in the ecological reports titled:

- Bat Survey Report (dated December 2023)
- Dormouse Survey Report (dated December 2023)
- Reptile Survey Report (dated December 2023)
- Ecological Appraisal (dated December 2023)
- Technical Note (dated 22nd July 2025)

and certified by the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team on 07/08/2025.

Prior to first occupation of any dwelling(s) hereby approved:

- i) the recommendations detailed in each of the reports and Note listed above shall be completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, and
- ii) evidence of compliance shall be supplied to the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

17. Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, above damp course level, a landscape management plan shall, by reference to site layout drawings of an appropriate scale, be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall include long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens. The subsequent management of the development's landscaping shall accord with the approved plan for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by the landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation or historical significance.

18. Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, above damp course level, a soft landscaping and planting scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full during the planting season November - March following commencement of the development or within a timescale to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include provision for the management, maintenance and replacement (as necessary) of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 10 years. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such for a minimum of 10 years.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and character of the area in the setting of a nationally recognised landscape.

19. Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, above damp course level, full details of hard landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include: proposed finished levels or contours, means of enclosure, car parking layout, other vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation areas, hard surfacing materials, minor artefacts and structures (eg; furniture, play

equipment, signs, lighting, refuse or other storage units, proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg; drainage, power, communication cables, pipelines, etc, indicating lines, manholes, supports etc). The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design and maintenance of existing and/or new landscape features.

20. Prior to any works above damp proof course, a lighting strategy which reflects the need to avoid harm to protected species and to minimise light spill, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There shall be no lighting of the site other than in accordance with the approved strategy. In particular, the strategy shall minimise impacts from lighting associated with preconstruction, construction and operational activities, and demonstrate how the current best practice (Bat Conservation Trust/Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2023) guidance has been implemented. This shall include details such as the following: artificial lighting associated with public realm lighting, car headlights associated with traffic movements through the development and internal and external lighting associated with the residential development.

Reason: to ensure the site's identified Greater horseshoe bat flight lines function as dark corridors (0.5 lux and warm light) and roosting features are unaffected by light spill, and generally in the interests of biodiversity.

21. Prior to commencement of any works on site, a dust management plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details. In particular, the DMP should detail the mitigation measures to be applied, and the procedures for their implementation and management.

Reason: in the interest of public health and safety.

22. Prior to completion of the damp proof course of any dwelling in each phase of development, samples and, or, product details of materials for all roofing, walling, chimneys, rainwater goods and external surfaces shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Additionally, a sample panel measuring 1 metre by 1 metres of each principal facing wall shall be constructed on site to show details of coursing, mortar mix and pointing. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: in the interest of welfare and good design which is a key aspect of sustainable development.

23. Prior to completion of the damp proof course of any dwelling in each phase of development, samples and/or product details of proposed style of uPVC

casement and sash windows shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: in the interest of good design which is a key aspect of sustainable development.

24. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and reenacting that Order) (with or without modification) no roof enlargement(s) or alteration(s) of the dwellinghouse hereby approved, permitted by Class B and Class C of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order, shall be erected or constructed.

Reason: To protect amenity and the character of the area with particular regard to the dark skies designation of the adjacent Cranborne Chase AONB

25. Prior to commencement of any works on site, a scheme for water efficiency for each phase of the development, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme demonstrate a standard of a maximum of 110 litres per person per day is applied for all residential development. The development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: This condition contributes to environmental objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

26. "Notwithstanding the submitted Noise Impact Assessment, prior to use or occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the acoustic performance and ventilation system required shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy.

Reason: In the interest of amenity of future occupiers."

27. Prior to any development above damp proof course of any of any dwelling hereby approved, details of erecting or incorporating 50% of the dwellings with a bat boxes and 50% of the dwellings with bird boxes shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: the area is noted to have a significant bat population and the site is within a short distance to the Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which attracts the need to enhance principle as set out in statutory law.

28. A landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior any development above damp proof course of any dwelling hereby approved. The content of the LEMP shall include the following:

- a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
- b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- c) Aims and objectives of management.
- d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
- e) Prescriptions for management actions.
- f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
- g) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.
- h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery.

The LEMP shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

Thereafter the approved LEMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the landscape character of the area and to mitigate, compensate and enhance/provide net gain for impacts on biodiversity.

Informatives:

1. Informative: The applicant is advised that, notwithstanding this consent, if it is intended that the highway layout be offered for public adoption under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980, the applicant should contact Dorset County Council's Developer-Led Infrastructure team. They can be contacted by telephone at 01305 225401, by email at dli@dorsetcc.gov.uk, or in writing at Developer-Led Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

2. INFORMATIVE NOTE: Privately managed estate roads

If the new road layout is not offered for public adoption under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980,
 it will remain private, and its maintenance will remain the responsibility of the developer, residents
 or housing company.

3. Informative:

The junction works referred to in the recommended condition above must be carried out to the specification and satisfaction of the Highway Authority in consultation with the Planning Authority and it will be necessary to enter into an agreement, under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, with the Highway Authority, before any works commence on the site. The applicant should contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email at athighwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

4. The highway improvement(s) referred to in the recommended condition above must be carried out

to the specification and satisfaction of the Highway Authority in consultation with the Planning

Authority and it will be necessary to enter into an agreement, under Section 278 of the Highways Act

1980, with the Highway Authority, before any works commence on the site. The applicant should

contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email at

highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team,

Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

5. The applicant should be advised that the Advance Payments Code under Sections 219-225 of the

Highways Act 1980 may apply in this instance. The Code secures payment towards the future

making-up of a private street prior to the commencement of any building works associated with

residential, commercial and industrial development. The intention of the Code is to reduce the

liability of potential road charges on any future purchasers which may arise if the private street is

not made-up to a suitable standard and adopted as publicly maintained highway. Further

information is available from Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by

email highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team,

Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

6. The Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service would recommend that you look to provide at least a 32mm minimum diameter water main which would enable the installation of sprinkler systems within the approved dwelling(s).

The Council considers this to be a key element in reducing the impact of fires. The Council believes there is compelling evidence that sprinklers systems are a cost effective way of not only reducing the number of fire deaths and injuries, but also reducing the economic, social and environmental impact of fires.

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 28 OCTOBER 2025

Present: Cllrs Richard Crabb (Chair), David Taylor (Vice-Chair), Alex Brenton, Barrie Cooper, Les Fry, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary and Belinda Ridout.

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Jim Bennett (Senior Planning Officer), Alex Skidmore, Louis Wicks (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice) and John Miles (Democratic Services Officer).

93. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs James Vitali and Carl Woode.

94. **Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made at the meeting.

95. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14th October to be confirmed at the next meeting given the short time frame between meetings.

96. **Registration for public speaking and statements**

Representations by the public to the Committee on individual planning applications are detailed below. There were no questions, petitions or deputations received on other items on this occasion.

97. **Saxon Maybank East Farm Grain Mills Bradford Abbas Sherborne DT9 6JN.**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. A similar proposal was refused by the Committee in March this year due to the detrimental impact of adjoining properties, lack of information on the drainage and the flood risk. The current application sought to address the previous reasons for refusal. The applicant had now made an appeal against non-determination by the local authority so the matter is in the hands of the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) and so the Committee was being asked to determine the Council's position for the appeal. The officer recommendation was for the purposes of the appeal, the Council would have been minded to grant permission. The existing development consisted of 10 caravan type units, 6 barn conversions. The refused scheme and current proposal were shown. To try and mitigate the

impact on neighbours, one lodge was moved approximately 1 meter away from number 11 and another lodge moved approximately 2 meters to the southeast. Lodge 18 moved slightly as it imposed on the right of way slightly. The current application was supported by a drainage strategy.

Public Participation

Gabriel Chan

Statement of objection - Gabriel Chan, No. 7 Saxon Maybank

One of the reasons he objected to the application was because Dorset Planning Department had failed to comply with its Public Sector Equality Duty in the years since the first, and materially identical, planning application was submitted, notwithstanding that he had raised the issue repeatedly.

Part of his demise, as clearly set out in the title registered at the Land Registry attached, was a garden at the back of his property. There was no direct access to the garden from his property. The normal access is via about 10 steps (approx. 15 feet) from the car park.

There was also a gate at the bottom of his garden that allowed unrestricted access to and from the garden to the common area of Saxon Maybank currently maintained as a lawn area. It was the only access for those with disability requiring wheelchairs and was protected by a right of way registered as pedestrian access in the attached title plan.

The title plan was constituted at a time when 'disabled access' was not a term used and recognised, or even in contemplation. So, the correct interpretation, as indeed as the law stands in England, was that '*pedestrians*' include those who are disabled and require wheelchairs. It was illegal to interpret "*pedestrians*" as meaning only those who are able-bodied and can move about on foot unaided. In any event, in the context of the right of way to/from his garden, it was clearly used for the sole purpose of differentiating it from vehicular access.

Under the proposed plan, wheelchair users of no. 7 would face one of the following scenarios:

- The lodge proposed to be built at the bottom of his garden would either completely block any wheelchair access to/from the garden or force the wheelchair users to take a sharp turn down a slope, which was highly dangerous.
- They would be accessing the garden from an area designated for car parking, therefore making it impossible when the space was taken up by parked cars, or equally dangerous if there were moving cars.
- There has been a suggestion that the area outside his garden would be turned into a 'meadow'. Expecting a wheelchair user to

navigate through a 'meadow' was nothing short of deliberate public humiliation, especially when it would be under the very close and full glare of those in the proposed lodge.

- In the event of an emergence, how would a wheelchair user be expected to leave their garden promptly and safely?

Any decision allowing the lodge to be built as proposed was a direct discrimination against disabled persons, and illegal under the Equality Act.

So far, he had seen no evidence of the Council following those principles set out in the decision of *R (Brown) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions* [2008] EWHC 3158 (Admin) for the exercise of its PSED, or the guidelines produced by The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) on discharging its PSED e.g. considering potential impacts and liaising with impacted groups. He had heard nothing but silence from the Council when the issue was raised.

He explained that the Council had already failed to comply with its PSED once in approving the previous application which led to the removal of all the disabled parking in Saxon Maybank. A continued failure in this regard would make Saxon Maybank a no-go area for disabled persons which cannot be reversed.

The Council must be aware that a failure by a local public authority to comply with its PSED was a legal error and the resulting planning decision can be judicially reviewed.

Paul Howard

Dr Paul Howard introduced himself and his wife, who had owned the renovated barn, No. 6, for over 13 years. All the properties on the site were subject to residential restrictions whilst the four stone buildings attract full council tax.

A little over 18 months ago, this committee (some of whom he recognised from that meeting), rejected the original proposal on the grounds of reduced amenity and lack of detail on drainage – this, after a lengthy discussion covering many points, included his objection regarding the lack of veracity of the original application in terms of the juxtaposition of the proposed new lodges and existing properties and boundaries with the resultant misrepresentation of parking, amenity and drainage.

He explained that this revised application did not materially vary from the original application and introduces further contradictory information, so you should uphold your original decision to reject.

In terms of reduced amenity, the revised application only modestly adjusts the original positions of the proposed lodges away from no. 11, and indeed places them closer to no. 10. The revised application attempts to equate the rural idyll of Saxon Maybank to densely populated seaside static caravan parks on the basis that the site was subject to a caravan park licence with Dorset Council. The aerial images you have seen in the planning officer's presentation, in lieu of a site visit, put pay to this conceit.

With regards to insufficient drainage information, again there was insufficient and contradictory information – not the basis on which to make an informed decision nor the basis on which to place non-determined conditions on an approved application.

Returning to the veracity of information presented, the revised application included a detailed topographic survey. This provides more accurate detail of what currently exists and actually highlights where the application conflicts with other documents and guidelines:

- Proposed Lodge 18 remained problematic – the parking space and turning circle were in conflict with Dorset Council parking requirements and access will involve lengthy reversing either in or out of the space – this along the route of the recently re-established public right of way. Furthermore, Proposed Lodge 18 was clearly less than 3m from the boundary of the site in conflict with the site licence
- Both the proposed drainage field and proposed lodge 20 are in the buffer zone of the TPO-protected oak

Finally, the revised application posits that the proposed expansion of the site was in response to growing need and interest – currently only two of the sixteen properties were available for let. He noted that the freehold of the site has been on the market over the last year.

He concluded that the Committee rejected the original proposal 18 months ago – this revised proposal was not materially different - It did not mitigate the two reasons for rejection and casts doubt on areas previously discussed by this committee. Therefore, he respectfully asked that the Committee uphold the original decision and reject the current application.

Mike Park

He explained that this application sat within the Somerset Levels and Moors catchment, which was particularly sensitive to phosphates in foul water.

So, the application must comply with the additional legal requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, which requires an Appropriate Assessment to ensure that - quote - "no reasonable scientific doubt" remains that phosphate risks are properly mitigated, in perpetuity.

Importantly the burden of proof was on the competent authority conducting the Assessment.

Even more importantly, these regulations are binary – if scientific doubt remains, if the assessment can't rule out an adverse effect, the application must be refused.

This cannot be dealt with as a planning condition.

Natural England delegated Dorset Council as the competent authority to carry out the Appropriate Assessment, and the Council conducted the Assessment relying entirely on the applicant's Foul Drainage expert report, concluding the threshold had been met.

However, the expert's report includes a site map on page 16 with annotations highlighting that in fact, the scheme was not shown in its entirety, and that - quote - "treated effluent is to discharge to the drainage field, subject to the completion of percolation testing" and the "exact sizing of the drainage field is also subject to percolation testing".

Using the manufacturer's specification, the actual drainage field for this proposed scheme would need to be approximately 320m², which was roughly the size of a Council swimming pool.

Yet the applicant has neither undertaken the critical percolation testing nor shown the full extent of the drainage field required for the scheme to be effective.

So, the applicant's own expert doesn't show how the scheme would operate.

Additionally, the Council's Building Control Team stated in October 2024 that - quote - "Percolation tests should be undertaken and the drainage field size and position calculated to ensure compliance prior to an approval being issued".

So, both the applicant's drainage expert and the Council's Building Control Team recognise that key information was missing. Significant scientific doubt therefore remains.

With this key information missing, it was simply not possible for anyone to demonstrate how the scheme would operate.

Yet in its Appropriate Assessment, the Council has overridden both its own Building Control Team and the applicant's expert by concluding that no scientific doubt remains - despite that missing information.

And the Planning Officer's report to Members recommending approval, proposes that the missing information was effectively dealt with as a condition of approval. This was in direct contravention of the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations.

An Inspector or Judicial Review would be obliged to recognise the Council's failure to meet the required threshold.

And Members are now being asked to ratify this failure, when the evidence before you - the expert report and Council Building Control comments - show unequivocally that key information was missing and therefore scientific doubt remains.

In compliance with legal requirements and the evidence before you, Members can only reach one conclusion today: scientific doubt remains, the assessment can't rule out an adverse effect, and so the application must be refused.

Sarah McDowall

Overbearing and loss of amenity

She informed the Committee that some of the Members were present when she spoke on this subject in March last year, in objection to a near-identical application, which was refused by this committee, on this and other grounds, only 2 of which were documented at the time.

As the aerial photo showed, her barn was a permanent, stone-walled, converted agricultural building, on which shed paid full council tax since October 2010. It was not used as a holiday rental and was specifically converted to be disability-friendly for her late husband who had MND. It was not moveable and not a caravan. Saxon Maybank was not a densely-packed static caravan park and the original

approved planning application was designed to afford appropriate amenity to both the renovated stone buildings and the luxury wooden lodges, in a tranquil rural setting.

Most of the natural light entered through floor to ceiling windows the entire length of the single storey eastern and southern sides of the barn. Lodges 19 and 20 were only a few metres from these windows, and would thus block the vast majority of natural light entering the barn.

No sunlight/daylight assessment had been done, contrary to Dorset Council website advice.

Lodge 19 would overlook her property via its side windows, facing towards the living area, and the outdoor deck and hot tub. Lodges 18 and 19 would overlook existing lodge 10 similarly. The access footpath would pass within a metre or two of her windows and the deck edging the barn by the east and south facing windows, omitted from the submitted plan.

None of the application plans showed measurements of the proposed lodges in situ. Nor the width of the grassed area, which was 25m. The Pathfinder Tuscany lodge was 12.2m long, similar to existing lodge 10, but with an extra raised raingarden at one end and deck at the other, adding at least another 3m. To retain the site licence the raised deck needed to be a minimum of 3m from the site boundary, and the application states lodge 19 would be 8.5m from the wall. She explained that the math simply did not add up and was exacerbated by the angled position. To keep the licence, lodge 18 would be impossible to build. All of this can be seen in the aerial photo.

She submitted that the committee's original decision was correct, and a tweak in location of the proposed lodges did not materially alter the adverse impact on amenity through sharing an overbearing relationship.

Andrew Tregay

Mr Tregay, the agent for the applicant and spoke in support of the application. He went through the application set out by the officers. The applicants sought the erection of three new holiday lodges as part of the existing holiday park. He made clear that these were not residential units and would be secured as such by condition. He noted that none of the external units had external curtilage and are used for holiday purposes. The application was a resubmission of a previous scheme refused by this Committee against the officer's recommendation. The applicant sought to address the concerns within this resubmission through the drafting of a detailed drainage and flood risk strategy as well as a modest redesign of the layout. He noted that the planning officer recommended the approval of the scheme which he fully endorsed. As per the officer's report, all technical matters had been fully assessed by the technical experts and professional officers, including rights of way, highways, trees, building control, Wessex Water, environmental assessment team, Natural England, natural environment team and the lead local flood authority. There were no technical objections to any aspect of the application. The submitted drainage strategy had been assessed by the LLFA and they concluded that the proposals would not increase the flood risk. Following, the designation of the footpath, a number of amendments were made to the plans, and the rights of way officer was satisfied with the amended plans. The applicant had sought to alleviate the Committee's concerns regarding separation and impact

on amenity. The separation between proposed units and the existing is comparable to unit facing across the holiday park which had historically been found to be acceptable. The separation was far more generous than the average holiday park that the Planning Committee had previously approved. As per the plans, the northwest elevations of the proposed lodges do not include openings and as such, there could not be any internal overlooking. He concluded that the proposed layout was proportionate, suitable and fully policy compliant. This was a modest and well-considered extension to an existing holiday park. Both national policy and local plan place an obligation to place significant weight on the need to support economic growth and the expansion of all types of businesses in the rural area, including tourism. He asked the Committee to not defend the appeal and offer a recommendation to approve to the inspector.

Cllr Robin Legg

He made it clear to members that this application was not just adding three additional units of accommodation towards our housing requirement. None of the units would count towards the housing land supply figures. There had been a very minor change to the application to the one that was refused contrary to the officer's recommendation 18 months ago. He hoped there would be a degree of consistency among elected members in the way they approached this application. In his opinion not very much had changed to the proposal. The key points were that the adverse effects on amenity for unit 11, the barn conversion and that the application was a really odd site. It was considered to be a caravan site but not only two of the units of the 16 were let as short term accommodation. It was not a coastal holiday park, where people fetched up for a couple of weeks and maybe come once or twice but never come again. A substantial number of units were either long-term licences or long-term leases. The ones which were lodges, pay no stamp duty on transfer and pay no Council Tax. The barn conversions, pay full increased stamp duty as classified as second homes and a double Council Tax. Some of the units on the site were paying more than traditional million-pound houses. The main living accommodation for unit 11 was an oak framed and glass structure, and anything in front of it, you would not be able to carry out daily living as another dwelling was in close proximity. The proper test was the amenity test, that should be applied to housing estates not a holiday caravan park. He referenced Econ 7 which was the requirement for proposals for a caravan site to show long term development to improve the quality and appearance of the accommodation on the site. The supporting text of that policy showed its purpose to encourage modernisation of outdated caravan sites so that the density of such sites was reduced and better-quality accommodation provided. This was an intensification and not a reduction.

Members questions and comments

- Comments were made that the distance between units should be safe for residents and uphold fire regulations.
- Cllr Jespersen asked if a condition could be included or an informative note to protect the rights of disabled local residents. She commented that there would be a loss of privacy.

- A comment was made that a disabled person would feel uncomfortable living on that site and people would be walking past windows.
- A Cllr commented that drainage and amenity had been addressed, and this was a holiday park, with no curtilage. People could walk between the units and that was the character of it. She personally could not see reasons on planning terms to refuse the application.

Members wanted officers to convey to PINS that the private access to Plot 7 is potentially being impacted by the proposed Unit 18. The private way is shown on drawing no. 4777/04 Rev B and does not appear to be an insurmountable problem. While this was pointed out to be a private/legal matter for resolution between the applicant and third party, members wanted the Inspector to be made aware of the situation and requested an informative be added to any decision in this respect. It is anticipated that the impacted third party will make representations directly to PINS on the matter.

The Senior Lawyer explained that the application was an appeal, and the Committee could not decide on the application and members were asked to put forward what the Committee's response would have been if it was able to determine the application. The resolution passed would be used to inform the Council's representations at appeal and be taken into account by the Inspector.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, the Council would have been minded to grant permission, was proposed by Cllr Rideout, and seconded by Cllr Jespersen.

Decision: that for the purposes of the appeal, the Council would have been minded to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and to a legal agreement to secure the proposed landscaping and biodiversity net gain arrangement which are beyond the application's red line boundary, listed in the decision list in the appendix.

The Inspector's attention is drawn to the private access to Plot 7 potentially being impacted by proposed Unit 18. The private way is shown on drawing no. 4777/04 Rev B and does not appear to be an insurmountable problem. While this was pointed out to be a private/legal matter for resolution between the applicant and third party, members wanted the Inspector to be made aware of the situation and requested an informative be added to any decision in this respect. It is anticipated that the impacted third party will make representations directly to PINS on the matter.

98. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

99. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 - 11.42 am

Chairman

.....

This page is intentionally left blank