

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 18 FEBRUARY 2026

Present: Cllrs David Tooke (Chair), Alex Brenton, Toni Coombs, Beryl Ezzard, Scott Florek, Spencer Flower, Barry Goringe, Hannah Hobbs-Chell, David Morgan and Julie Robinson

Apologies: Cllrs Duncan Sowry-House and Andy Skeats

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

Lara Altree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Cheryl Barlow (District Valuer), James Brightman (Senior Planning Officer), Kim Cowell (Development Management Area Manager (East)), Susan Hetherington (Transport Development Liaison Manager), Claire Hicks (Planning Officer), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic & Governance Services Officer), Naomi Shinkins (Lead Project Officer), Mark White (Enforcement Officer), Louis Wicks (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice) and Cari Wooldridge (Planning Officer)

81. Declarations of Interest

Cllr S Florek declared an interest to agenda item 8, it was agreed that he would not take part in the debate or vote but would read out a statement as Local Ward Member and would leave the room when the item was considered.

82. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 14th January were confirmed and signed.

83. 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.

84. P/FUL/2024/06847 - Site to the East of New Road, at the junction with Christchurch Road, West Parley

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans, aerial photographs and submitted drawings, the Case Officer identified the site within the Eastern Area in relation to Parley Cross, outlining the surrounding context, key views and the belt of mature trees along the western boundary. The site formed part of the Eastern Road allocation at West Parley under Policy FWP6, with Policy FWP5 supporting retail improvements. Outline permission had previously been granted, with

subsequent amendments through reserved matters, including the Lidl supermarket.

The proposal comprised retirement living apartments, a café with drive-thru, EV charging and public open space, supported by illustrative material and details of materials. The application had been advertised in 2024 and 2025. Statutory consultees raised no objections overall, although West Parley Parish Council objected. The site lay within the urban area and was not allocated employment land. While retail floorspace would be lost, officers considered the benefits, including meeting strong demand for retirement housing and contributing to housing supply, outweighed the harm. The scheme was considered sustainable and compliant with the development plan, including Policies LN3 and LN6, and was supported by a reviewed viability assessment.

The apartment mix exceeded national space standards and was deemed appropriate. The Highway Authority raised no objection, confirming the development would be safe and accessible. Parking provision, including 36 spaces for the retirement units with the inclusion of 3 disabled bays, mobility scooter storage, and parking for the café and drive-thru, was considered policy compliant. The design responded to local context, with revisions improving articulation and creating a varied skyline. The contemporary appearance, landscaping, native planting, open space provision and biodiversity enhancements, including biodiversity net gain, were considered acceptable. The site lay mainly within Flood Zone 1, drainage arrangements were satisfactory, and noise mitigation would be secured by condition.

Heathland mitigation contributions would be secured due to the site's proximity to the New Forest, with an adjacent SANG available. Airport safeguarding requirements would be addressed by condition. The recommendation was to delegate authority to grant planning permission subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement and conditions, or to refuse permission if the agreement was not completed by 18 August 2026 or such extended time as agreed.

The officer's recommendation was to delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager East to either:

- A) GRANT planning permission following completion of a S106 Planning Obligation agreement and subject to conditions

OR

- B) Refuse permission if the S106 agreement is not completed by 18 August 2026 or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager East

Public Participation

Mr G Monkcom, a resident of West Parley, addressed the Committee and confirmed that his original objection to the application remained. He raised a

number of concerns, including the lack of need for a drive-through café and his objection to the drive-through element, stating that consuming coffee while driving could constitute a criminal offence. He highlighted the area's ageing population and emphasised the importance of prioritising a health centre for local elderly residents, noting the limited existing provision. Mr Monkcom also expressed environmental concerns, referring to frequent rainfall and the potential for development on Green Belt land to displace surface water, as well as wider issues relating to climate change and sewage discharges into rivers. He urged the Council to undertake a site visit, including consideration of the SANG, and requested that the planning application be reconsidered.

Members questions and comments

- Noted the viability statement in the conditions, recognising the absence of affordable housing, and queried which aspects of the development would be at risk if the scheme was not viable and how viability could be achieved.
- Raised concerns regarding the consequences of reduced profit.
- Queried how cars would access the retail shops.
- Asked whether residents would have access to the roof.
- Questioned why no zebra crossing was provided to the Lidl supermarket.
- Observed that the design did not connect with the surrounding area and appeared isolating.
- Referenced slide 67 and sought clarification on when obligations needed to be paid to secure the legal agreement.
- Noted parish council objection regarding the design not being appealing.
- Queried whether both buildings were fitted with PV panels.
- Raised concerns about potential loss of retail provision.
- Noted that parking for retail shops was in an unsuitable location.
- Commented that insufficient justification had been provided from a retail perspective regarding the suitability of the scheme.
- Expressed disappointment at the elevations, noting that ground-floor flats could have included shops to improve attractiveness.
- Highlighted a discrepancy in tree heights and requested clarification regarding screening.
- Queried whether a monetary contribution had been provided.
- Questioned the relevance of amenity space for residents with limited mobility.
- Requested confirmation that the surface water assessment had been revised according to current Environment Agency provisions.
- Queried whether there were ponds within the green space.
- Raised biodiversity concerns, including whether car parking areas could incorporate green roofs and that more could have been done to enhance biodiversity on site.
- Sought clarification regarding pre-commencement conditions.
- Asked about potential pedestrian access from the Lidl site to the development.

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 delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager East to either:

- A) GRANT planning permission following completion of a S106 Planning Obligation agreement and subject to conditions

OR

- B) Refuse permission if the S106 agreement is not completed by 18 August 2026 or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager East

GRANT as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Barry Goringe, and seconded by Cllr Beryl Ezzard, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement set out in Section 16 of the officer's report.

85. **P/FUL/2025/04406 - The Old Malthouse, High Street, Langton Matravers, Swanage, BH19 3HB**

With the aid of a visual presentation, the Case Officer identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies, advising that an updated information pack had been published and circulated. The site lay adjacent to the settlement boundary, partly within the Langton Matravers Conservation Area, with nearby Grade II listed buildings and public rights of way crossing and adjoining the land. Formerly used as school playing fields, the site was bordered by housing to the south and east and farmland to the west and north. Views from the High Street, existing access arrangements and surrounding facilities were shown, and it was noted that mature trees would be retained where possible to preserve the rural character.

The proposal comprised residential development including 40% affordable housing, delivering a balanced mix, together with a central green, new access arrangements and a comprehensive landscape strategy. Officers advised that there would be no harm to the Conservation Area or listed buildings, with appropriate separation distances and additional landscaping providing screening. All dwellings would have private gardens, good light and safe pedestrian access. Twenty-five third-party representations had been received. Highways, refuse and servicing arrangements were considered acceptable, and public rights of way would be safeguarded. The scheme provided biodiversity enhancements and an acceptable drainage strategy within Flood Zone 1. Although the former sports field would be lost, it had not been used since the school's closure, and a new sports court and long-term community provision were proposed. Officers concluded that any limited harm was outweighed by the wider community benefits.

The Officer recommendation was to delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager East to either:

- A) GRANT planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure: - 40% affordable housing - Education contribution - Special education needs contribution - GP surgery contribution - Public right of way contribution

OR

- B) Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below if the S106 agreement is not completed by 18 August 2026 or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager East.

Public Participation

Mr L Merrick spoke in objection, describing the proposal as the third phase of development by the applicant and noting that the second phase, which began in spring 2023, was only now nearing completion almost four years later. He raised ongoing concerns regarding flooding and drainage and referred to the conservation area and national landscape designation, stating that the site was closely linked with established rights of way and that the development would be harmful. He also highlighted the village's low provision of shops, services and employment, the presence of vacant units, and highway safety concerns relating to a dangerous junction and narrow High Street, concluding that the proposal required re-examination.

Mr P Golob addressed the Committee in objection and confirmed that written notes had been provided. He acknowledged that the proposal presented a number of benefits but referred to policies within the Purbeck Local Plan and noted that the site lay outside the settlement boundary. He stated that the Parish Council and local residents considered there to be a significant risk that the southern concentration strategy would be undermined. Mr Golob emphasised the critical nature of these concerns and urged the Committee to require robust Section 106 obligations as a key outcome of any decision.

Ms C Bolton, speaking as Agent, addressed the Committee and stated that the members had received a short briefing pack. She advised that the proposal included six affordable homes and was supported by relevant planning policies in an area identified as having housing need. She confirmed that the scheme had been assessed in detail and was supported, preserving key views while providing a new community sports facility and nursery provision. In response to concerns regarding traffic, she noted that mitigation measures had been incorporated. Ms Bolton stated that the benefits of the proposal outweighed any identified harm, that the development would integrate into the landscape, and that it was the product of

extensive discussions. She commended the officer's report and recommendation to the Committee.

In accordance with Procedural Rule 8.1 the committee voted to extend the duration of the meeting.

Mr J Sinclair, on behalf of Langton Matravers Parish Council, thanked the Committee and raised concerns regarding traffic management, stating that increased traffic volume and speed would heighten the risk of road traffic accidents and that further calming measures were required. He referred to site safety issues during the second phase, advising that agreed traffic management arrangements had not been adhered to. He also noted that residents had been unable to access existing sports facilities, which had remained locked, and requested further detail on future provision. Finally, he expressed concern about the high number of second homes within the development and sought assurance that the proposed dwellings would be occupied by permanent residents.

Councillor Ben Wilson, Local Ward Member, confirmed he did not oppose the application but sought clarity on total vehicular movements and timing of traffic assessments. He emphasised public and highway safety, noting congestion near the school and a blind junction, and suggested a Traffic Regulation Order may be needed. He acknowledged residents had endured four years of development and welcomed that the scheme focused on primary homes, demonstrating the Local Plan was working.

Members questions and comments

- Expressed disappointment that most affordable homes were flats rather than houses, and suggested reconsidering house types to ensure equality with other homes.
- Noted the difficulty of widening the junction for better access.
- Commented positively on the use of green space and the attractive setting of the site.
- Observed that some buildings and garages used cladding, which was considered too dark, and suggested efforts to fit with the character of the area.
- Welcomed the inclusion of three-bedroom affordable housing and a total of six affordable homes.
- Liked the overall design and layout of dwellings and the mix of tenure in the community.
- Queried whether a viability test had been carried out and whether the scheme remained financially viable, noting reassurance regarding social housing provision being discounted at land value.
- Requested confirmation that roads would meet Dorset Council adoption standards.
- Queried whether resting areas would include benches.
- Asked if the Parish Council could request an alteration to the settlement boundary.
- Suggested it would have been beneficial to include bungalows.
- Raised questions about wheelchair accessibility, including door widths.

- Asked how sports facilities would be managed and about overall site accessibility.
- Raised concerns regarding the impact of lighting and potential conditions to restrict external lights on housing.
- Queried whether chimneys were functional or purely a design feature.
- Requested clarification whether roads on site met Dorset Council adoptable standards
- Emphasised that perspective purchasers should be made aware of relevant details through informative notes.

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 delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager East to either:

- A) GRANT planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure: - 40% affordable housing - Education contribution - Special education needs contribution - GP surgery contribution - Public right of way contribution

OR

- B) Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below if the S106 agreement is not completed by 18 August 2026 or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager East was proposed by Cllr Toni Coombs, and seconded by Cllr Beryl Ezzard, subject to the conditions set out in the officer report and the informative note regarding site management.

Decision: Grant subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement, as set out in Section 19 of the officer's report

86. **P/FUL/2025/06517 - Barn opposite Old Quarry Close, Worth Matravers**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans, aerial photographs and site photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies. The site lay outside the defined settlement boundary and comprised a building originally constructed for agricultural purposes. The proposal sought partial demolition and conversion, with associated landscape and parking provision. Members were shown photographs of the site and barn curtilage, together with proposed floor plans and elevations. The total floor area had been reduced by four square metres, and details included a balcony designed to allow views towards the coast. Enhancements through additional landscape planting were proposed, and the conversion was considered capable of providing

sufficient daylight. Further conditions were recommended to restrict external lighting.

An objection had been received from the Parish Council on the grounds that the development was not compatible with the landscape and represented an expansion of residential use outside the settlement boundary. No letters of objection had been received from third parties. The proposal included on-site parking and turning provision, and access arrangements were considered acceptable. Case officer corrected error in committee report as 6 parking spaces proposed not 9. An illustrative 3D comparison view was presented. The ecological assessment had been approved, there were no flood risk issues, and impacts on Dorset heathland would be mitigated through secured CIL contributions. No affordable housing contribution could be secured due to vacant building credit. Policy H14 to secure homes as primary dwellings. Officers summarised the key issues and recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions as tilted balance applied and benefits of the proposal towards housing land supply not outweighed by adverse impacts. The Officer recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Public Participation

Ms E Jeffries, speaking as agent, stated that the site was underutilised and no longer in active use, making its repurposing sensible. She noted that the proposal addressed the Council's housing land supply, with the only change being the proposed use, while the design remained identical to the previously approved scheme. She highlighted that the earlier scheme had a positive impact and contributed to the Dorset National Landscape, and that the current proposal was high-quality, consistent with the setting, and incorporated natural materials. Ms Jeffries confirmed that the development contributed to the Council's five-year housing land supply and commended the officer's recommendation.

Members questions and comments

- Raised concerns regarding the adequacy of parking provision for four-bedroom dwellings.
- Commented on the height of the proposed building.
- Noted the need to ensure sufficient space for parking.

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** as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Barry Goringe, and seconded by Cllr Scott Florek, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant for the reasons set out in Section 17 of the officer's report.

87. P/HOU/2025/06963 - 38 Brook Lane, Corfe Mullen, BH21 3RD

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans, aerial photographs and photographs of the existing building, the Case Officer identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies to Members. The location and

site context were explained, and existing and proposed plans, floor plans and elevations were displayed. Members were advised that the dwelling had previously been significantly extended, and the proposal sought further enlargement as shown on the submitted site plans. The Local Ward Member had expressed support for the application.

Officers advised that the site lay within the Green Belt and that the proposed extensions were considered disproportionate to the original dwellinghouse. As such, the development was inappropriate and would result in harm by reason of inappropriateness and loss of openness. The proposal did not fall within any of the exceptions identified in policy as not constituting inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and no very special circumstances had been advanced that would clearly outweigh the identified harm. The Officer recommendation was to refuse permission.

Public Participation

Councillor Scott Florek, on behalf of Councillor Duncan Sowry-House, spoke in support of the small single-storey annex extension for multigenerational living. He noted it was sympathetic to the area, caused no harm to the street scene, and was low and discreet. Flood risk, drainage, and biodiversity concerns could be managed, no highway issues were identified, and the social benefits were clear, outweighing any harm. He invited the Committee to approve the application.

Members questions and comments

- Noted that the proposal would have limited impact on openness.
- Sought clarification on whether there would be access from the proposed annex into the existing dwelling or if they would remain separate.
- Queried what harm, if any, the proposal would cause to the surrounding area.
- Asked whether the extension constituted a disproportionate addition to the annex or the main building.
- Raised a query regarding “limited infilling” from the report and whether the proposal would cause substantial harm to the Green Belt.
- Councillor Coombs proposed granting the application under the relevant section of the NPPF, noting that the development would remain ancillary to the existing dwelling; the motion was seconded by Councillor Morgan but fell at the vote.
- Raised concern that granting the application could set a precedent, noting that the applicant had not engaged in a pre-application discussion.
- Queried whether the Council’s five-year housing land supply affected the decision.
- Noted that the report did not provide evidence that the development would support intergenerational living.

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 **GRANT** the officer’s recommendation and **REFUSE** the application, was proposed by Cllr Spencer Flower, and seconded by Cllr Alex Brenton, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To refuse for the reasons set out in Section 16 of the officer's report.

88. **P/FUL/2025/06576 - Kids Love Nature Avon Forest Park Brocks Pine St Leonards and St Ives BH24 2DH**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans, aerial photographs and an artist's impression, the Case Officer identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies. The development comprised a modest dome to support an existing land-based rural business, positioned alongside the visitor centre and read as an extension. Its scale, design and non-reflective outer surface were considered appropriate within the rural context and would not result in adverse visual impact or harm to Green Belt openness. The proposal was considered appropriate development within the Green Belt.

The site lay within an area of high groundwater levels; however, there was no identified surface water flood risk. The scheme was compliant with Core Strategy Policy ME6, with acceptable vehicular access onto the A31 and no material impact on the highway network. Impacts on trees and biodiversity were assessed as acceptable subject to mitigation. The recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions and informative notes as set out in the Officer's report. The Officer recommendation was to grant subject to conditions.

Public Participation

Ms E Jeffries, speaking as agent, stated that the proposed extension to the existing kindergarten was modest in scale with limited visual impact when viewed in context. She noted that the structure would be durable and require minimal maintenance, with negligible detrimental light spill, and that the development would support the continued growth of the facility.

Mr A Shepherd, speaking as applicant, highlighted the significant impact of the proposal on early years education, noting its role in connecting children with conservation. He emphasised that the site attracted visits from universities nationally and internationally and described the development, including the dome, as the next chapter in the site's work, making a meaningful difference to the community.

Members questions and comments

- Noted that the proposal represented a great opportunity.
- Highlighted that it would provide excellent facilities and experiences for young children.

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** as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Spencer Flower, and seconded by Cllr David Morgan, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant for the reasons set out in Section 17 of the officer's report.

89. **P/VOC/2025/06703 - Wareham Riverboats, Abbots Quay, Wareham, BH20 4LW**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans, aerial photographs and site photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies. The site lay within the town centre, the Green Belt and the Conservation Area. Members were advised of site constraints, including flood risk, and were shown photographs of the existing kiosk and its prominent quayside setting.

The application sought a variation of conditions to amend the design of a previously approved kiosk, reducing its footprint and altering the structure in response to flood risk. A smaller metal-framed building was proposed, with the pump retained in existing location. Approved and proposed site plans were compared, together with elevation drawings and details of materials. Metal structure to be finished in slate grey colour with timber cladding and roof to be added later in the year. Officers advised that the key considerations related to the character and appearance of the area. Matters of principle do not need to be considered as a variation to a previously approved scheme. No objections had been received from the Town Council. The recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions and informative notes as set out in the report. The Officer recommendation was to grant subject to conditions.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Welcomed the proposal, noting that the reduced footprint would provide better working conditions.
- Observed that the slightly smaller building was more effective in its design and function.

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** as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Beryl Ezzard, and seconded by Cllr Toni Coombs, subject to conditions and informative notes set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant for the reasons set out in Section 17 of the officer's report.

90. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

91. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 3.58 pm

Chairman

.....