

## **EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 9 MARCH 2022**

**Present:** Cllrs Toni Coombs (Chairman), Shane Bartlett (Vice-Chairman), Mike Barron, Alex Brenton, Barry Goringe, David Morgan, David Tooke, Bill Trite and John Worth

**Apologies:** Cllrs Robin Cook, Mike Dyer and Julie Robinson

**Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):** Kim Cowell, Liz Adams, Claire Hicks, Peter Walters, Diana Mezzogori-Curran, Cari Woodridge, Chris McDermott, Phil Crowther, Susan Dallison and David Northover

#### **257. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Robin Cook, Mike Dyer and Julie Robinson.

#### **258. Declarations of Interest**

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

#### **259. Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 28 July 2021, 25 August 2021, 29 September 2021, 13 October 2021, 27 October 2021, 1 December 2021, 5 January 2022 and 9 February 2022 were confirmed.

#### **260. Public Participation**

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.

#### **261. Planning Applications**

##### **6/2021/0262 - Withy Lakes, Church Knowle, BH20 5NG - Erect detached self-build rural exception site dwelling**

The Committee considered application 6/2021/0262 to erect a detached self-build rural exception site dwelling, at Withy Lakes, Church Knowle – the definition of a rural exception site being a small site used for affordable housing, in perpetuity, where the site would not normally be used for housing,

in addressing the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection. How any resale value formula was derived was clarified, with the District Valuer recommending a resale value of 47% of the market value. The prescriptions on self-build affordable housing were drawn to the attention of Members and, due to the increasing numbers on the housing register and the shortage of general needs affordable housing, officers considered it was vital to provide such affordable housing.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how these were to be progressed; and what this entailed. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on residential amenity and the character the area, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of how the development was to look – including its design, dimensions and appearance; access and highway considerations; environmental and land management considerations; drainage and water management considerations, the means of landscaping and screening and the development's setting within that part of Church Knowle and the Dorset AONB.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development, with the characteristics and topography of the site being shown. Views into the site and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

What assessment had been made in the officers coming to their recommendation were drawn to the attention of the Committee, with the proposal being considered to be acceptable in relation to material planning considerations, with all significant planning matters having been appropriately, or adequately, addressed.

Church Knowle Parish Council opposed the application on the grounds that it would be development of agricultural land outside the defined settlement boundary and in the AONB.

Steve Tapscott, the agent, considered the application to be of merit and was designed to meet a specific need with the development not being remote from and village and adjacent to an already established property.

Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, were:-

- access, road maintenance issues and ownership of the road
- how the S106 agreement would be enacted and on what basis this would be, in the event this element was required
- what self-build development entailed and how this was applied
- the prescriptions associate with rural exception sites

Officers addressed the questions raised – and provided what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable.

Of importance was that officers considered there to be no material considerations which would warrant refusal of the application and that this was the basis of the assessments made and the recommendation before the Committee.

From debate, the majority of the Committee considered the proposal to be acceptable - in meeting an identified need and in making the best use of the land available – and considered that this development would be of benefit to the Church Knowle community and serve to meet the issues Purbeck had in being able to satisfy its identified housing need.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representation; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor Alex Brenton, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed - by 7:1 - to grant permission, subject to the conditions and informative noted set out in paragraph 17 of the officer's report.

### **Resolved**

a) That permission be granted subject to conditions and the completion of a satisfactory S106 Legal Agreement to secure the provision of the affordable housing in perpetuity

or

b) That permission be refused if the legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) is not completed within 6 months from the date of committee or such extended time as agreed by the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement.

### **Reasons for Decision**

- Para 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise
- The proposal is compliant with the NPPF, Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 and the Affordable Housing SPD in terms of Rural Exception Site Affordable Housing provision.
- There is not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

**6/2021/0249 Tower House, Tower Hill, Bere Regis - Demolish existing property and erect 5 detached properties with associated parking, access and landscaping.**

The Committee considered application 6/2021/0249 to demolish an existing property and erect 5 detached properties with associated parking, access and landscaping at Tower House, Tower Hill, Bere Regis.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how these were to be progressed; and what this entailed. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on residential amenity and the character the area, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of how the development was to look – including its design, dimensions, configuration and appearance; along with its ground floor plans; the materials to be used; access and highway considerations; environmental and land management considerations; drainage and water management considerations, the means of landscaping and screening and the development's setting within that part of Bere Regis and the Conservation Area.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development, with the characteristics and topography of the site being shown. Views into the site and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

What assessment had been made in the officers coming to their recommendation were drawn to the attention of the Committee, with the proposal being considered to be unacceptable in relation to material planning considerations as the proposed development would erode the existing transitional character of the area by establishing a development which will be highly visible in the Tower Hill streetscene given the two dwellings proposed to the front of the plot. Accordingly, the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the character of the Bere Regis Conservation Area due to the intensification of development on the application site which will result in detrimental impacts on the characteristics of the Conservation Area.

The Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) and the Bere Regis Townscape Character Appraisal (TCA) were considered to be of relevance when assessing the application with the CAA emphasising the importance of the village edge and transitional qualities of the various back lanes which form a legible boundary along the north side of the village core. Whilst bringing some highway access benefits, the proposed carriageway widening would further alter the character of this established 'back lane' which was considered to be a significant characteristic of the Bere Regis Conservation Area.

These assessments formed the basis of the officer's recommendation to refuse the application.

From formal consultation, Bere Regis Parish Council supported the application on the grounds that the widening of the road would be beneficial.

Peter Rennison objected to the proposal on the grounds of overlooking, the destruction of a natural hedgerow, traffic and access issues and that it was not included in the Neighbourhood Plan. A submission by Patrick Hamilton was read to the Committee who also objected on the grounds of traffic, townscape, history/heritage and overlooking.

Jonathan Blackmore - the applicant - supported the proposals as he considered the application to be of public benefit and would provide much needed housing in the village and there were mitigating measures to address issues of concern and the parish council were supportive too. Suzie Gee was unable to attend as expected but her views were read to Committee in that there was need for more houses in the village to meet local need, that the site would still be quite secluded and not prominent and that there would be benefits from the road widening proposal.

Parish Councillor Ian Ventham agreed that whilst there were some concerns of overlooking, the benefits of widening the road would outweigh this. He confirmed the Parish Council was in favour of this development and supported in full development and, whilst this site was not in the Neighbourhood Plan, it did about it.

Giles Moir, the agent, considered the development to be acceptable and provided much needed housing for Bere Regis.

Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, were:-

- access arrangements and what weight should be given to the benefit of the road widening proposal
- How this development contributed to meeting housing need in Bere Regis.
- how the Conservation Area would be impacted by the development and what effect there would be on neighbouring amenity
- The proximity between Plots 1 and 2 and the neighbouring established properties in Tower Hill – this being a distance of only some 11 metres instead of the recommended 21 metres and how this might have a bearing on privacy and overlooking.

Officers addressed the questions raised – and provided what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable.

Of importance was that taking the CAA into consideration officers considered there to be less than substantial harm caused by this proposal and on that basis could not recommend approval.

From debate, the majority of the Committee considered the recommendation was acceptable in the circumstances given the adverse effect it would have on the conservation area and consideration that given the proximity of the development to Tower Hill properties this should also be a reason why the application should be refused. Should the scheme be able to be redesigned to increase the said distance, then this was likely to be more acceptable but, as it stood, this was not the case. However, some members considered the application to be acceptable as it was – especially as the Parish Council was supportive - and would provide much needed housing to meet local need.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representation; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor Mike Barron, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed - by 5:4 - to refuse permission.

### **Resolved**

That application 6/2021/0249 be refused.

### **Reasons for Decision**

As set out in paragraph 16.1 of the officer's report:-

The proposed development, by virtue of the infilling of the site, is considered to cause less than substantial harm to the Bere Regis Conservation Area.

The public benefits offered are not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused.

and

The proposal would introduce two new units in close proximity to The Poppies and Meadow View Barn on Tower Hill which would introduce harmful overlooking to the front of those dwellings resulting in loss of privacy to the detriment of the occupants' amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy D of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1, paragraph 130 of the NPPF and the Purbeck Design Guide.

**P/HOU/2021/04823 - 7 Stanbarrow Close, Bere Regis, Wareham - Proposed single/two storey extension to rear elevation. Extension of side boundary wall and form new pedestrian access.**

The Committee considered application P/HOU/2021/04823 – for a proposed single/two storey extension to rear elevation, an extension of a side boundary wall and to form a new pedestrian access at 7 Stanbarrow Close, Bere Regis, Wareham.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how these were to be progressed; and what this entailed. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on residential amenity and the character the area, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed. The planning history of the site was explained too.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of how the development was to look – including its design, dimensions and appearance; access considerations; the means of landscaping and the extension's setting within that part of Bere Regis.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development, with the characteristics of the site being shown. Views into the site and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

What assessment had been made in the officers coming to their recommendation were drawn to the attention of the Committee, with the proposal being considered to be acceptable in relation to material planning considerations, with all significant planning matters having been appropriately, or adequately, addressed.

Bere Regis Parish Council supported the application.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points were raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, which Officers addressed to the satisfaction of the Committee. It was also clarified that this application required a Committee decision given that a Council employee had a vested interest in it.

Of importance was that officers considered there to be no material considerations which would warrant refusal of the application and that this was the basis of the assessments made and the recommendation before the Committee.

From debate, the Committee considered the proposal to be acceptable – given that amended plans had now overcome initial amenity issues relating to unreasonable loss of light or an overbearing impact and had also scaled back the proposal which could be accommodated on the site without harm to the character of the area. The proposal now accorded with the policies of the Local Plan.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor David Morgan, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed – unanimously - to grant permission, subject to the conditions and informative noted set out in paragraph 17 of the officer's report.

### **Resolved**

That application P/HOU/2021/04823 be granted permission, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 17 of the officer's report.

### **Reasons for Decision**

- The proposal was acceptable in its design and general visual impact – paragraph 15.3.
- There was not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity - paragraph 15.4.
- There were no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.
- There was no adverse impact on the character of the area.

### **P/FUL/2021/04102 - Pear Tree Nursery School, Parley First School, Glenmoor Road, Ferndown, BH22 8QD - Demolition of existing nursery structures and construction of replacement nursery building.**

The Committee considered application P/FUL/2021/04102 for the demolition of existing nursery structures and construction of replacement nursery building at Pear Tree Nursery School, Parley First School, Glenmoor Road, Ferndown. Officer's confirmed that this application required a Committee decision given that it was a Council led application.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how these were to be progressed; and what this entailed. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on residential amenity and the character the area, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of how the development was to look – including its design, dimensions, configuration and appearance; along with its ground floor plans; the materials to be used; access and highway considerations; environmental and land management considerations; drainage and water management considerations, the means of landscaping and screening and the development's setting within that part of Ferndown.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development, with the characteristics and topography of the site being shown. Views into the site and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory

understanding of all that was necessary. The need for the development was explained and this investment was designed so as to ensure that the facility would be able to provide for the quality of service being maintained: there would be a public benefit by replacing the existing prefabricated nursery building with a more modern and sustainable structure. It would be situated within the same footprint of the existing buildings on site.

What assessment had been made in the officer's coming to their recommendation were drawn to the attention of the Committee, with the proposal being considered to be acceptable in relation to material planning considerations, with all significant planning matters having been appropriately, or adequately, addressed.

Tina Henning-Stevens - who ran and managed the facility - considered the development to be necessary so as to be able to continue to provide a good quality standard of service to those using it. The current facilities were gradually becoming unfit for purpose so this replacement was essential to have. She and her staff remained wholly committed to maintaining the service it had and this investment would go a long way in helping to achieve that.

West Parley Parish Council had raised no objection to the application.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points were raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, were

- What eco features might be able to feature in the development
- How this more sustainable building would benefit those using it
- What planting would be done in terms of screening

all of which officers were able to answer to the satisfaction of the Committee.

Of importance was that officers considered there to be no material considerations which would warrant refusal of the application and that this was the basis of the assessments made and the recommendation before the Committee.

From debate, the Committee considered the proposal to be acceptable and would provide for a more sustainable, practical and good facility in improving the lives of children that was able to continue offering the good quality standard of service for which it had become known.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Barry Goringe and seconded by Councillor Shane Bartlett, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed – unanimously - to grant permission, subject to the conditions and informative noted set out in paragraph 17 of the officer's report.

## **Resolved**

That application P/FUL/2021/04102 be granted planning permission subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 17 of the report.

### **Reasons for Decision**

The proposal would be of public benefit by replacing the existing prefabricated nursery building with a more modern structure

- The location was considered to be sustainable, and the proposal was acceptable in its scale, design, materials and visual impact.
- There was not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- There were no adverse landscape impacts.
- There would be no additional traffic movements generated by the development.
- There were no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application

### **P/FUL/2021/03912- Hayeswood First School, Cutlers Place, Colehill – Formation of a new vehicle entrance, relocate existing pedestrian entrance and reformation of the car parking and car park spaces. New access ramp, fencing and gates.**

The Committee considered application P/FUL/2021/03912 for the formation of a new vehicle entrance, relocate existing pedestrian entrance and reformation of the car parking and car park spaces, together with a new access ramp, fencing and gates at Hayeswood First School, Cutlers Place, Colehill. Officer's confirmed that this application required a Committee decision given that it was a Council led application.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how these were to be progressed; and what this entailed. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on residential amenity and the character the area, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of how the improvement works would take place and look – including its design, configuration and appearance; access and highway considerations; environmental and land management considerations; and the development's setting within that part of Colehill.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development, with the characteristics and topography of the site being shown. Views into the site and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary. The need for the improvement works was on the grounds of safety, access and traffic flows.

What assessment had been made in the officer's coming to their recommendation were drawn to the attention of the Committee, with the

proposal being considered to be acceptable in relation to material planning considerations, with all significant planning matters having been appropriately, or adequately, addressed.

Colehill Parish Council fully supported the application.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points were raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, were

- What eco features might be able to feature in the development
- How this more sustainable building would benefit those using it
- What planting would be done in terms of screening

all of which officers were able to answer to the satisfaction of the Committee.

Of importance was that officers considered there to be no material considerations which would warrant refusal of the application and that this was the basis of the assessments made and the recommendation before the Committee.

From debate, the Committee considered the proposal to be acceptable and would provide for a more sustainable and safer route into the school in avoiding conflict between traffic and persons.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor David Morgan, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed – unanimously - to grant permission, subject to the conditions and informative noted set out in paragraph 17 of the officer's report.

### **Resolved**

That planning permission in respect of application P/FUL/2021/03912 be granted, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 17 of the report.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

- The proposal will be of public benefit as it re-routes the accessible pedestrian route away from vehicle routes into and out of the school site.
- The location is considered to be sustainable and the proposal is acceptable in terms of its design and general visual impact.
- There is not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity, landscape or highway safety
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

**262. Urgent items**

There were no urgent items for consideration.

**Duration of meeting:** 10.00 am - 12.30 pm

**Chairman**

.....