

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 25 OCTOBER 2022

Present: Cllrs Sherry Jespersen (Chairman), Mary Penfold (Vice-Chairman), Jon Andrews, Tim Cook, Les Fry, Brian Heatley, Carole Jones, Stella Jones, Emma Parker, Val Potheary and Belinda Ridout

Apologies: Cllrs

Also present:

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

Robert Lennis (Area Lead (Major Projects) Eastern), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Mike Garrity (Head of Planning), Steve Savage (Transport Development Manager), Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer), Joshua Kennedy (Apprentice Democratic Services Officer), Emma Ralphs (Planning Officer), Simon Sharp (Senior Planning Officer) and Elaine Tibble (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

125. Apologies

There were no apologies for absence received.

126. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Carole Jones declared her interest as a trustee to Hall and Woodhouse. It was agreed that she was allowed to take part in the discussion and vote.

127. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 30th August were agreed and signed.

128. 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.

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.

129. Planning Applications

Members considered written reports submitted on planning applications as set out below.

130. **P/PRES/2022/03207, Land off Haywards Lane, Child Okeford**

The Case Officer, Robert Lennis, presented to members the erection of 26no. dwellings. Members were informed that outline planning permission had already been approved by this Planning Committee and this scheme was a resubmission of the reserved matters details following a refusal earlier in the year. Members were shown the location of the site and reminded that the context of the site was relatively unconstrained as the conservation area was some way off; the scheduled ancient monuments associated with Hambledon Hill and Hod Hill also some way off. He also noted the local landscape and views from afar and that no listed buildings would be affected.

The Case Officer provided members with details of the new layout and landscaping plan of the site and noted how the previous reason for refusal had been addressed particularly about the layout. Mr Lennis noted the affordable housing integration and comments from a Planning Inspector on the matter. He showed members the proposed elevations of the dwellings and gave details of potential impact to the neighbouring amenities. The recommendation was to grant planning permission.

Steve Savage, the Council's Transport Development Liaison Officer, informed members of the number of parking spaces allocated to each dwelling, as well as the parking layout generally. Members were also informed that each property had cycle parking in the garages and sheds. He also discussed accessibility to each dwelling regarding refuse collection. Highways did not identify any grounds for refusal and therefore supported the application.

Public Participation

Members of the public and the Parish Council spoke in objection of the planning application. Concerns were raised regarding the character of the village, neighbour amenities, and the loss of hedgerows which ruin wildlife carriageways. They also informed members that there were no pavements to the centre of the village, therefore there was no safe access to local amenities from the site. Concerns were also raised regarding the increase in traffic which would have been created directly outside the school which would have caused a dangerous road for parents and children to walk on as well as those accessing the site. An increase in pollution was also discussed. The Parish Council informed members that Child Okeford was already contributing the Dorset Council's five-year housing land supply and asked members to ensure the development was suitable for the village as there was a lack of engagement between applicant and residence of Child Okeford.

The agent spoke for the application. Members were given details regarding the site recognising the local need for affordable housing and details were provided regarding the design of the affordable housing units which would have allowed mitigation with other dwellings. The agent also informed members that considerations had been made regarding car parking and had been moved to benefit the site. Members were informed that previous reasons

for refusal had been considered and addressed. The agent hoped that the members would grant planning permission.

Members questions and comments

- Maintenance of hedging
- Proposed tree species on site
- Amending condition 5 subject to landscaping condition for tree species to the rear of neighbouring close to be no greater than 15 metres.
- Confirmation on there no longer being a brick wall entrance
- Location of refuse bins on the site.
- Is the attenuation base already existing on the site.
- Square footage of housing sizes.
- Number of parking spaces per housing.
- Site access and visibility.
- Consider the location of some dwellings to make it more acceptable for neighbouring residents.
- Members praised the redesign of the application and the considerations that had been made to improve the application.

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, in being proposed by Cllr Pothecry and seconded by Cllr Penfold subject to conditions.

Decision: To approve planning permission subject to modification of condition 5 and the other conditions set out in the Officer Report.

131. **P/FUL/2022/01086, Land at Tarrant Valley Interiors, The Old Chicken Sheds at Stubhampton**

Simon Sharp. Planning Officer, presented to members the application to Demolish existing commercial workshop & erect new electric vehicle (EV) hub including workshop, EV/PV information point, retail area & including cafe/pit stop and a covered parking area with roof mounted solar array to both structures. Members were shown the location of the site as well as aerial photographs and details regarding listed buildings in the area. Members were assured that there was no harm identified to these buildings. The Case Officer provided members with details of the proposed floorplan of the site as well as details of the outdoor seating for retail use as well as charging points. Site access and the proposed elevations for car parking were also discussed. The recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions in the report.

Steve Savage, Head of Highways, informed members that the site would include 26 car parking spaces, including two disabled parking spaces and some fast and slow charging points. Members were informed that parking met the standards and there would be few needed for staff. He also discussed the reduction in speed limit; therefore, the road would be subject to 30mph.

Highways also informed members that the proposal would generate more traffic, but the proposal wouldn't have a severe impact and there would be low traffic movement. Highways did not identify any grounds for refusal and therefore supported the application.

Public Participation

Members of the public spoke in objection to the planning committee. Concerns were raised regarding the site being in an unsuitable location and therefore it would create an increase in road traffic on an unsuitable and dangerous road. The public also discussed the impact that the development would have on the AONB. They also raised their concerns on the impacts of protected species in the area. The Parish Council discussed the lack of need of the development in the area, they praised the use of renewable energy but strongly believed it would be ideal in a different location as the local people didn't want or need it. Members of the Public also informed members that the site would increase light pollution, consideration would need to be made regarding opening hours. They urged the committee to refuse the recommendation to approve planning permission.

The agent spoke for the application. He informed members as to how the applicant had supported the climate emergency through the introduction of charging points. He assured members that the proposed building would have been a similar size to the original and the additional size would have been for the use of charging points. The agent confirmed that there would be no competition to the local farm shop.

Members questions and comments

- Confirmation regarding biodiversity plan being approved.
- Risk of site flooding.
- Amount of charge people would receive from slow charging points.
- Pedestrian access to the site and visibility. Members raised their concerns regarding an increase in pedestrian movement on the road.
- Concerns regarding environmental impacts on the area and view from footpaths.
- Number of hours and timings of access to the charging points.
- Consideration of rapid chargers.
- Lighting restrictions on site.
- Members discussed the importance of encouraging small businesses, especially those making improvements to the environment.
- Members praised the good screening but had concerns regarding glazing and asked the planning officer for details about anti-glare glazing.
- Opening hours and use of the outside seating area was discussed. Members considered conditioning for winter opening hours due to light pollution. Some members didn't believe that conditions would be sufficient.

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, in being proposed by Cllr Pothecry and seconded by Cllr Andrews.

Decision: To overturn the proposal and refuse the planning application for the following reasons:

1. The development is within an unsustainable location where a need has not been demonstrated for the mixed use proposed. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 2 and 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan 2016.
2. The extent of glazing proposed, the associated external lighting and the hours of operation will result in a significant and harmful level of adverse impact to the dark skies and landscape qualities of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, contrary to policy 24 of the North Dorset Local Plan 2016.

Cllr Jones and Cllr Pothecry proposed that the meeting would carry over 3 hours.

132. P/OUT/2021/05444, Land North Of Old Pound Court Bourton Dorset

The Case Officer presented to members the Erection of 3 dwellings, new vehicular and pedestrian access & associated parking. Members were shown the location of the site as well as aerial photographs and views from neighbouring properties. The proposed elevations of the dwellings were also presented. Members were provided with details of the AONB, they were informed that the site was near but not within it and the proposed site didn't cause any harm to it. The recommendation was to grant planning permission.

Public Participation

Members of the public and the Parish Council spoke in objection of the planning application. They raised their concerns regarding the development being outside the settlement boundary and the damage it would have caused to the AONB. Neighbours to the proposed site were concerned about privacy as a well-used area in their garden would've been completely overlooked due to the plans of the roof height being metres higher than their home. The Parish Council didn't see any environmental, social, or economic benefits of the development and didn't believe that it met the need of the village. The public reminded members to refer to the neighbouring plan as it reflected the setting and heritage of the village, they believed that this development would have been detrimental to the area. Particularly ruining views from listed buildings. They urged the committee to refuse the planning application.

The agent spoke on behalf of the applicant. She shed light on the council's position to provide housing on suitable land for developments and gave details of the size of the development. She believed that the site was an appropriate size and would be an asset to the village. The agent asked the members to support the recommendation to approve planning permission.

Members questions and comments

- Further development in the area

- Confirmation on ridge height of the proposed dwellings.
- Impact on AONB and nearby listed buildings
- Risk of flooding
- Visual harm of the development to the area.
- Impacts on the amenities of the existing dwellings.
- Members raised their concerns regarding the proposed site being outside of the settlement boundary. Officers were commended for reducing the number of dwellings, however, members believed that the development was not needed in the area. Members discussed the importance of following local neighbourhood plans, therefore didn't approve of a development being outside the settlement boundary.

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, in being proposed by Cllr Ridout and seconded by Cllr Pothecriy.

Decision: To overturn the proposal and refuse the planning application for the following reasons:

The location of the proposed development would extend beyond the existing built form into the undeveloped landscape, impacting important views across the existing undeveloped paddocks and towards the Grade II listed Church tower to the detriment of the landscape quality of the area, the setting of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire AONB and the setting of the listed Church. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to be contrary to sections 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policies 4, 5 and 24 of the North Dorset Local Plan and policies 1, 2, 3 and 10 of the Bourton Neighbourhood Plan.

133. P/FUL/2022/04510, St Osmunds Church Of England Middle School, Barnes Way

Simon Sharp, Planning Officer, presented to members the application to remove 8no. timber-framed single glazed high level window units and replace with powder-coated aluminium double-glazed units. Replace timber door with powder-coated door. Members were shown the location of the site and the entrance. Simon Sharp, Planning Officer provided members with details of the existing windows and the proposed replacement windows. Recommendation was to approve.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Members discussed the importance of helping the school conserve energy by the replacement of the units. They noted the need that the school had and were happy to offer their support.

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, in being proposed by Cllr Jones and seconded by Cllr Fry.

Decision: To grant planning permission.

134. **P/FUL/2022/02962, Harbourvale School**

Simon Sharp, Planning Officer, presented to members the application Install a 3m high twin mesh fence and 1 x No. gate. The fence line will sit inside of the existing fence (iron fencing on top of a brick wall which will remain in situ). Members were provided with details of the location of the site as well as details of the proposed fencing.

Public Participation

Roger Marsh spoke in favour of the application. He informed members that the pupils within the school were disadvantaged and needed security. He discussed the funding which had been provided to the school which contributed to outdoor equipment and a sensory garden. Mr Marsh discussed the importance of this fence to help keep children safe and to prevent vandalism of the school.

Members questions and comments

- Members took note of the funding which had been given to the school and thanked those who supported the school. Members believed that the fencing was an important addition to the school.

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, in being proposed by Cllr Andrews and seconded by Cllr Pothecriy.

Decision: To grant permission.

135. **P/HOU/2022/04717, 2A Mill Lane Charminster**

The Case Officer presented to members the application to Erect first floor extension over existing garage, new dormer windows and associated works. Members were shown aerial photographs of the site. Details of the proposed site plan was also provided. The Case Officer also provided details of a nearby listed building which the site caused no harm too. Members were shown details of the proposed design of the elevations. Recommendation was to grant planning permission.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Screening between windows and neighbouring properties.

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, in being proposed by Cllr Fry and seconded by Cllr Jones.

Decision: To grant planning permission.

136. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

137. Exempt Business

There were not exempt items.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 3.42 pm

Chairman

.....