

Public Document Pack



EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 3 SEPTEMBER 2025

Present: Cllrs David Tooke (Chair), Alex Brenton, Toni Coombs, Beryl Ezzard, Spencer Flower, Barry Goringe, David Morgan and Andy Skeats

Apologies: Cllrs Duncan Sowry-House, Scott Florek and Julie Robinson

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

Lara Altree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Kim Cowell (Development Management Area Manager (East)), Alison Curtis (Development Team Leader - Place), Susan Hetherington (Engineer (Development Liaison)), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), Anna Lee (Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement), Diana Mezzogori-Curran (Senior Planning Officer), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic Services Officer) and Naomi Shinkins (Lead Project Officer)

Also Present: Christine Reeves (Retail Consultant - Lambert Smith Hampton)

30. Declarations of Interest

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

31. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2025 were confirmed and signed.

32. 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.

33. P/FUL/2024/04629 - 26 Canford Bottom, Colehill, BH21 2HE

The Senior Planning Officer, using a visual presentation with plans and aerial photographs, identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies. It was noted that the applicant had submitted a briefing note, which had been published online and circulated to members before the meeting. The applicant has also submitted a letter to the case officer, which has been circulated to the Chair and shared with Members via the update sheet on the day of the committee.

The location of the site was shown on a map of the area and the nearby settlement boundaries and Green Belt were highlighted. It was explained that part of the site fell within the Green Belt.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that there had been over 500 local responses to the application consisting of 350 objecting, 174 supporting and 9 general comments. The Ward Member and Parish Council had also objected to the application and four consultees offered comments. It was explained that because part of the site fell within the Green Belt and also did not satisfy all the criteria listed in paragraph 155 of the NPPF (Green Belt) and that very special circumstances were required to justify any development and that any harm to the Green Belt must be outweighed by substantial benefits.

Officers considered that the application site was a sustainable location for the proposed development, due to good transport links. The loss of employment land on site was also considered. The case officer explained the supply of employment land within the area, the number of jobs that would be created by the development and the employment land supply in East Dorset. However, as no robust evidence had been submitted to justify loss of current employment land it remained a reason for refusal as the proposal did not fully comply with Policy PC2 of the Development Plan.

A retail need assessment was required because the site fell within the Green Belt and this was undertaken by a Retail Consultant (Lambert Smith Hampton). The catchment area of the proposed store was shown and it was explained that there was currently an oversupply in retail supply in the area. It was not anticipated that there would be any increased demand for additional supply up until 2040. A retail sequential test carried out by the applicant, found that there were no other suitable alternative sites in the catchment area.

The landscaping proposal was shown to members and it was noted that a full landscaping plan would be required to be submitted by the applicant, should the application be granted. Elevations of the proposed store were also provided, showing a single storey design, which would be set back from the road by 34 metres, to reduce the visual impact of the building. Officers considered that concerns over landscaping and appearance could be mitigated through conditions.

A new crossing was proposed to allow for safe pedestrian access to the site. It was considered that there would be a modest increase in traffic and that the proposed junction would be expected to operate within its capacity with no adverse impact on highways safety. The proposed access and parking plans were provided and it was noted that the proposed 120 spaces was below the recommended amount, however the applicant had demonstrated that 120 spaces was sufficient to serve the store.

The Senior Planning Officer stated that an acoustic fence to the north and west would be necessary to limit noise pollution to nearby residential properties. Conditions would also be required to mitigate against light pollution from the store and from the pedestrian crossing. Concerns against anti-social behaviour in the car park outside of operating hours had also been addressed through a proposed barrier that would restrict entry times into the car park. It was considered that the

application was acceptable on the grounds of bio-diversity subject to offsite contributions and there were also no concerns over land contamination, subject to conditions.

The case officer explained that the application was considered unacceptable in the Green Belt and the retail assessment did not identify demand for the store in the area. Therefore, the harm to the Green Belt was not outweighed by the benefits that had been identified.

Ms Pascall, Ms McLeavy and Mr Lennox spoke in opposition to the application. They raised concerns about the impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents given their proximity to the proposed store, due to excess noise and light pollution, as well as increased traffic in a busy area. They also stated that the application represented inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Ms Lovell read out a statement on behalf of Ms Lewis, who stated that an affordable supermarket was a welcome addition to Wimborne, due to the lack of choice in the area for local residents and that due to the number of new homes being built in the area there would be increased demand going forward.

Mr Saunders spoke as the applicant for the application, he stated that the application site made little contribution to the value of the Green Belt and was more similar to Grey Belt land and that the development would make efficient use of the land and replace old and underused buildings. He stated that the development would also provide approximately 40 full and part-time jobs.

Cllr Johnson spoke on behalf of Colehill Parish Council and Cllr Todd spoke as the Ward Member, in objection to the application. They raised concerns about increased traffic from new customers and delivery vehicles and the potential impact on local businesses, such as convenience stores, which would lose custom from the development. They also stated that the loss of Green Belt land would result in a permanent loss of openness in the area and the proposed store would have a detrimental impact on the area in terms of visual appearance, noise and light pollution.

The Senior Planning Officer clarified that the Environmental Protection Officer was satisfied that concerns about neighbouring amenity could be addressed through condition and that officers acknowledged the potential for Grey Belt consideration, however that did not overcome the primary concerns with the application.

Officers and the Retail Consultant provided the following responses to questions from members:

- There were no public rights of way across the Green Belt land.
- The Tree Officer had identified that the Leylandii had been on site for some time, but their exact age was unknown.
- Access to the delivery bay for HGV's had been subject to a swept path analysis and it had been demonstrated that a delivery vehicle could follow the one-way system in the car park and enter the bay in reverse gear.
- The number of car park spaces proposed was 13 less than the guidance stated, however the applicant had demonstrated that this would be a sufficient number for the size of the store.

- Alternative access to the site was not explored, as the scheme presented was considered acceptable from a highway's perspective.
- Visibility splays from the access were considered acceptable for the speed of the road and distances involved.
- The employment figures for the current site had been submitted by the applicant and had not been verified. It was considered that there would be a modest increase in employment from the development.
- Based on the evidence submitted by the applicant and the benchmark trading of other stores in the area, it was not considered that there was a need for the store.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application several members raised concerns with the application, which included the harm to the Green Belt, as well as increased traffic levels and the impact on neighbouring amenity. Other members stated that they believed there were substantial benefits to the application, those being the offer of an affordable supermarket that could be used by local residents and the reduced traffic from people leaving the area to access supermarkets in other places. It was also considered that due to the increasing population of Wimborne that there would be sufficient demand for the supermarket to justify the harm to the Green Belt.

It was proposed by Cllr Ezzard and seconded by Cllr Skeats, that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

Upon being put to the vote the motion to refuse the application fell.

It was proposed by Cllr Flower and seconded by Cllr Goringe that the application be granted, subject to conditions relating to landscaping, materials, drainage acoustics, access, parking and security, biodiversity, land contamination, air quality and lighting. They considered that the poor provision of supermarkets locally and the additional choice of an affordable supermarket, that the application would bring, did constitute very special circumstances which justified the development of Green Belt land. There was also planned growth in the area with a significant number of new homes being built in Wimborne, therefore the new supermarket would provide community benefits.

The Senior Planning Officer provided a list of condition headings that would be required should the application be granted.

Decision: Resolution to grant subject to planning conditions and a S106 agreement with authority delegated to the Head of Planning and the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement to agree the wording of conditions with the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Eastern Area Planning Committee; and referral to the Secretary of State.

34. **6/2021/0282 - Land east of Wareham Road, Lytchett Matravers**

The application was deferred until a later date, as the meeting was no longer quorate.

35. **6/2018/0228 - Binnegar Hall, Binnegar, Wareham, BH20 6AT**

The application was deferred until a later date, as the meeting was no longer quorate.

36. **P/FUL/2023/07467 - Land South Of A352 (Wareham Road), Binnegar, East Stoke Purbeck**

The application was deferred until a later date, as the meeting was no longer quorate.

37. **Urgent items**

38. **Exempt Business**

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 12.35 pm

Chairman

.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Eastern Area Planning Committee
23 July 2025

Eastern Area Planning Committee
Wednesday 03 September 2025
Decision List

Application: P/FUL/2024/04629

Application Site: 26 Canford Bottom Colehill BH21 2HE

Proposal: Demolish existing buildings and construct a Class E(a) retail store and associated parking, servicing arrangements and landscaping.

Recommendation: Refuse - Inappropriate development in the Green Belt (see full reasons for refusal in section 18 of this report).

Decision: Resolution to grant subject to planning conditions and a S106 agreement with authority delegated to the Head of Planning and the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement to agree the wording of conditions with the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Eastern Area Planning Committee; and referral to the Secretary of State.

Application: 6/2021/0282

Application Site: Land east of Wareham Road Lytchett Matravers

Proposal: Residential development of site for 95 dwellings, new vehicular and pedestrian access onto Wareham Road and other associated works including landscaping and open space.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a legal agreement to secure:

- 40% affordable housing
- Education contribution
- Special education needs contribution
- GP surgery contribution
- Public right of way contribution
- Nutrient neutrality requirements
- Local equipped area for play requirements.

Or, if no agreement is completed then refuse for failure to secure the necessary obligations.

Decision: The application was deferred as the meeting was not quorate.

Application: 6/2018/0228

Application Site: Binnegar Hall, Binnegar, Wareham, BH20 6AT

Proposal: Redevelopment for 48 Dwellinghouses & Village Hall including access improvements, parking & landscaping.

Recommendation:

- a. Grant planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a section 106 legal agreement,

Or,

- b. Refuse planning permission if within six months from the day of this Committee the section 106 legal agreement is not completed.

Decision: The application was deferred as the meeting was not quorate.

Application Number: P/FUL/2023/07467

Application Site: Land South Of A352 (Wareham Road) Binnegar, East Stoke Purbeck

Proposal: Use of land as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) with associated access, landscaping, infrastructure and alterations to road.

Recommendation:

a. To grant permission for the creation of this SANG subject to conditions and the signing of a S106 legal agreement to secure its delivery prior to the occupation of any dwelling approved under planning application ref. 6/2018/0228 and continued availability in perpetuity.

Or

b. Refuse planning permission if within six months from the day of this Committee the section 106 legal agreement is not completed.

Decision: The application was deferred as the meeting was not quorate.

This page is intentionally left blank