

Public Document Pack



NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 8 JULY 2025

Present: Cllrs Alex Brenton, Barrie Cooper, Les Fry, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout, James Vitali and Carl Woode

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

Lara Aintree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Cass Worman (Planning Officer), John Miles (Democratic Services Officer) and Annabel Cox (Planning Officer).

74. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Cllr David Taylor.

75. Declarations of Interest

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

76. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 27th May 2025 were confirmed and signed.

77. 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.

78. P/FUL/2024/04528, Garages at Wingfield Road, Sherborne, DT9 3HH

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 to demolish a block of 48 garages, 37 which were currently occupied. The garages were mostly used for storage, and it was estimated that 5 garages were used for cars. The site would be redeveloped with two dwellings including landscaping and associated works. Each parking space would have electric charging stations. The Highway Authority was satisfied with road safety and parking.

Public Participation

Cllr Jon Andrews spoke as a member of the public and not as a Councillor. He had been a resident of Wingfield Road between 1969 to 1975 and remembered playing

football around there, but this morning a fire engine would not have been able to get around from the Richmond Road junction along Wingfield Road due to the number of parked vehicles. He informed that Wingfield Road has 72 houses in total, and not one parking space was available in Wingfield Road which is a hazard to public safety. The houses were a very nice design but just in the wrong place. There was one car parked and this morning 4 vans. He asked the Committee to not accept the application, as the sheltered accommodation needed emergency vehicle access, which would not have been able to get there this morning, without damaging and moving vehicles due to parked vehicles. The garages were for people who were self-employed, and demolishing these garages would mean that these people would have to find other garages which there is none available in Sherborne.

Ms Lindridge explained that she was a resident of half acres, and many residents were elderly and disabled and her living room and bedroom was 7 foot away from the garages. There would be a loss of privacy, dust upheaval and traffic disruption and essential services would be at risk. She wanted a peaceful life and did not want the hassle that the demolition would bring.

Ms Day informed that amenities, fire services, ambulances came in most days, and supermarket vans needed to get in and out and residents relied on taxis and cars to take them into town, and were unable to park in their own parking spaces as lots of car park on Wingfield Road. She stated that the Council should consider the implications on behalf of the residents, and there was 7 feet between the garages and herself. Some residents had crutches, wheelchairs, mobility scooters, and needed those pavements to use and not cars parked on them. As for drop down curves people park on them and ambulances and fire services would not be able to get in.

Andrew Tregay (the Agent for the application) explained that the application was to create two new dwellings in a highly sustainable location, a short distance from the town centre and no doubt a suitable location for two dwellings. There had been no technical objections from the Council specialist officers or highway officers. He acknowledged that there had been some concerns from residents over the parking situation and he reiterated what was set out in the officer report. It was a private garage block, not associated with any other specific development, was not a part of the Council's parking strategy and did not have any obligations to maintain parking space for any particular properties. The garages supported a low number of cars and were reaching the end of their life span. 25% of the units were currently vacant and the applicant did not monitor the units but were used mostly for storage rather than parking and the units were too small to store modern vehicles. The houses would be limited to 1 and a half storeys, have electric charging points, and there were no technical reasons for why this application should be refused.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Fry asked why people were parking on the roads and if they were working locally or was it due to free parking?**
- **Cllr Jespersen asked about the access by emergency vehicles and delivery vans to the bungalows.**

- Cllr Crabb commented that Half Acres behind did get a high number of emergency vehicles, more than you would in the normal neighbourhood, as carers park there.
- Cllr Vitali commented that development would intensify the parking situation, and it was important that the applicants did not intensify parking issues.
- Cllr Rideout requested reassurance that the height of the dwellings would not impact the enjoyment of the neighbours' gardens or create overshadowing.
- Cllr Jespersen commented that it was a private site, and the landowner could decide to demolish the garages and use the site for anything else at any time. Parking at Wingfield Road was not a relevant issue to the application, and the only thing that the committee should consider is if it exacerbated the issues on the roads. There were adequate gardens and there were no grounds to refuse the application.
- Cllr Brenton commented that the dwellings would be built to modern standards, insulated, she added that this was a planning application rather than a parking 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 representations; 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 Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Brenton.

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report and in the appendix.

79. **P/FUL/2023/01247, 10 High East Street, Dorchester, DT1 1HS**

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 to erect a first-floor extension to provide 1 No. unit of residential accommodation. The roof was designed to protect the amenity of the window. There would be no direct overlooking, and the second room was intended to be office store, rather than a bedroom. The application was in a town centre location, with a variety of buildings. The roof was designed so that light could reach the window and there would be no blocking of the window and light of the window would not be significantly impacted as it was East facing.

Public Participation

Mr Kendle lived at 5 Icen Mews, the back-wall of the proposed development was the back-wall of his courtyard garden, and this wall was less than 12 metres from the living room of his house. He explained the overbearing nature of the proposal, and he referenced that the officers report stated that the development would not be overbearing due to the courtyard already experiencing an enclosed character and the development only amounted to an additional 60cm of height of the party-wall. He explained that the officers report underplayed the effect of the development. The boundary wall at the end of his garden was already the tallest

structure enclosing the space, and crucially, it was the only boundary visible directly from his living room. This made it the most prominent feature from both inside his home and garden.

The proposal sought to significantly increase the height of that wall, with a sloping roof rising further behind it. That change significantly worsened the sense of enclosure and visual dominance of the structure, contrary to the protections offered by Policy 25 of the North Dorset Local Plan, which required development to safeguard the amenity of existing residents, including protection from overbearing structures and loss of outlook. This development only represents an additional 60cms of height.

The officer's report included that the proposal would only amount to a roughly 60cm increase in height, or a 14% increase in the height of the current party-wall. He informed that this claim was inaccurate and disingenuous for two reasons: The report stated the additional height of the party-wall is 60cms but the sloping roof, rises above the party-wall by a further 140cms and that the highest point was 100cms back from the party-wall. A 200cm increase was significantly higher than a 60cm one that the report drew your attention to.

The architectural drawings on which the 60cm figure was based were inaccurate because they: Stipulated that the floor-space between the current ground-floor and the new first-floor was 14cms when at a minimum, taking into account joists and fire-protection, it would need to be at least 29cms. The drawings also indicated that the current parapet wall is 429cms high, but he measured it, and it was only 402cms at its highest point and 390cms at its lowest. Therefore, allowing for a realistic depth of floor-space, and for the actual height of the parapet wall, the party-wall would need to be 114cms higher than the parapet wall currently is at its lowest point, and, when including the sloping roof, the development would be 254cms higher than the current wall. So rather than the 14% increase in the height suggested in the officer's report, this development actually amounted to a 63.5% increase in height. He concluded that it would significantly overshadow and overbear the property and the inaccuracy in the drawings suggested that the architectural drawings could not be trusted and therefore, any development would be based upon must be objected.

Ms Pacitti explained that she was the co-owner of 10A High East Street, situated directly to the west of 10 High East Street. Her property featured a single window in the upstairs rear room, which served as the exclusive source of external light for that space. The proposed construction would significantly diminish the amount of light entering the room. Although the height of the build had been reduced, it would negatively affect the light levels, and the impact would be more pronounced in winter exacerbating the concern. During winter months, light availability was already limited, necessitating an increase in natural light rather than a decrease. This development would result in an exceedingly gloomy environment, requiring artificial lighting even during daytime hours.

The proposed construction posed a severe infringement on her established right to light, which had been recognized for over two decades. The flat roof adjacent to her property raised significant concerns, as it could lead to damp issues due to the accumulation of rainwater and debris. She requested clarification regarding the method of joining the flat roof to her structure and the direction of water runoff.

Under the current proposals, there appeared to be no provision for runoff management, leading to the potential trapping of water in the channel between the front and rear elevations. She expressed concern regarding several vents for her bathroom and kitchen located on the wall designated for construction. There were legitimate worries about the possibility of these outlets becoming obstructed. The current submission did not adequately address how these concerns would be mitigated, and she remained sceptical that a party wall agreement would provide a solution. The proposed construction would infringe upon the privacy of her rear balcony, as it would be directly overlooked by the new build, which featured windows facing her property.

The area was already densely built and lacked privacy; this development would exacerbate that issue. The new placement of the extractor fan—now positioned lower between 9 High East Street and 10A High East Street, and at the same height as her window—raised additional concerns. The odour from the extractor could become confined between the front and rear elevations, significantly impacting the upstairs room. The existing odour report was insufficient, as it did not consider the new circumstances in which odour could be channelled and trapped in the corridor formed between the adjacent buildings. She raised reservations regarding the implications of ongoing maintenance for the property, particularly given that it was located in a conservation area. The proposed development would restrict access to the rear and side of her building, thereby hindering the ability to perform routine repairs to the roof, walls, and balcony. This could have detrimental effects on her property, and the revised plans fail to address these concerns.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Jespersen commented that she was not confident that the layout of the development was the best use of space in terms of living conditions. She questioned whether the committee could add conditions that prevents future occupiers from using the area designated as an office as a bedroom. She queried the amenities of the flat itself and whether residents had any access to outside space for drying washing, putting out their bins and a place to park their bike. She commented about the odour in small spaces and that odours can settle. She raised concerns with the flat roof, concerns with flue, smaller lobby, loss of light to the living room of 10 a. The development was overbearing on the courtyard garden of number 10 a, and no place for domestic living.**
- **Cllr Fry raised concerns over the noise and smell and the flat roof being very hard to maintain and could leak. There would be a loss of privacy to the area and potential damage to surrounding buildings.**
- **Cllr Potheary expressed concerns that there were too many problems that would need to be put right by condition. She would have preferred to see method statement put in with the documents. She was most concerned about the flue, in line with balcony in 10 A sitting out there being on the same level, would be appalling. If approved the development would be half built before we realised all sorts of issues.**

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, a motion to **REFUSE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Potheary, and seconded by Cllr Jones.

Decision: To refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below and in the appendix.

Reasons for refusals:

The proposal would lead to a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of 10A High East Street due to inadequate daylight to the living space of the adjacent property due to the proximity height and design of the proposed development, contrary to Policy ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

The proposal would lead to a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of 5 Icen Mews due to overbearing and overshadowing of the garden area of the adjacent property due to the proximity height and design of the proposed development, contrary to Policy ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

The proposal due to its size and layout would fail to make sufficient provision for bin stores, recycling facilities, drying areas, cycle parking, mobility scooter storage and private amenity/garden space and associated storage and composting facilities, which would adversely impact on the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed residential unit, contrary to policy ENV.11 and ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

80. **P/LBC/2023/01251, 10 High East Street, Dorchester, DT1 1HS**

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. This application was to consider the listed building consent and looking at the impact only on heritage assets and the historic fabric of the building.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Jespersen commented that she did not see any reason for why this application should be refused listed building consent as the Conservation Officers were keen on the improvements this development would bring.**

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, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning

permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Rideout.

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report and in the appendix.

81. **P/HOU/2024/06120, Sunnydale, White Lackington, Piddletrenthide DT2 7QU**

Cllr Vitali left the meeting at 12:33 and gave his apologies.

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 to demolish store and erect a two Bay Garage/Workshop. Photographs of the map showed the location, in an AONB. The site access, tree protection plan and the full extent of vegetation along northern boundary were presented to the Committee.

Public Participation

No public participation.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Brenton asked if there was rainwater collection on the building and she appreciated the solar panels on the roof and suspended floor.**
- **Cllr Rideout asked about the back access and whether there were bat boxes.**
- **Cllr Fry asked about a water retention condition and some form of water storage on the site.**

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 Brenton, and seconded by Cllr Rideout.

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report and in the appendix.

82. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

83. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 12.48 pm

Chairman

.....

Northern Area Planning Committee

8th July 2025

Decision List

Application Reference: P/FUL/2024/04528

Application Site: Garages at Wingfield Road Sherborne DT9 3HH

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage block and redevelopment with two dwellings including landscaping and associated works.

Recommendation: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

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: AT278 001 Location Plan A/3358/04 Proposed Site Plan A/3358/01 Plot 1 Proposed Floor & Roof Plans A/3358/02 Plot 2 Proposed Floor & Roof Plans A/3358/01 Proposed Elevations & Sections.

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

3. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and providing clarification of how drainage is to be managed during construction and a timetable for implementation of the scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details including the timetable for implementation.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to protect water quality.

4. Prior to the occupation of the development details of maintenance and management of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme 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 the future maintenance of the surface water drainage system, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

5. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until an Allocation Certificate has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which addresses the additional nutrient input arising from the development within the fluvial catchment area upstream of the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar site and on the same hydrological pathway. The Allocation Certificate shall be a written certificate issued by the phosphate credit provider confirming the allocation of the full phosphate credit requirement generated by the development, thereby mitigating the additional nutrient load imposed on the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar site by the development when fully occupied enabling the local planning authority to conclude on the basis of the best available scientific evidence that such additional nutrient loading will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the protected site, having regard to the conservation objectives for the site.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is phosphate neutral in perpetuity.

6. Details of measures to limit the potential consumption of wholesome water use by persons occupying the new dwelling to 110 litres per person per day as measured in accordance with regulation 36 of the Approved Document for Part G2 of the Building Regulations 2010 (or any equivalent regulation revoking and/or re-enacting that Statutory Page 25 Instrument) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the dwelling is occupied. The submitted details shall include a water consumption calculation for the dwelling in accordance with the Approved Documents referred to above. The approved measures shall be implemented and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority thereafter.

Reason: To secure nutrient neutrality through effective mitigation in the interests of protected Habitat Sites

7. The development hereby approved must not be first brought into use unless and until the detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures set out within the submitted Ecological Impact Assessment (HalpinRobbins Ltd, 23.04.2024) have been completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable. Thereafter, the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the submitted details.

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

8. Before the development hereby approved commences a Construction Method Statement (CMS) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The CMS must include: • the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors • loading and unloading of plant and materials • storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development • delivery, demolition and construction working hours The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

Reason: To minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network.

9. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised, the visibility splay must have 25m to the north and 43m to the south of clear and unobstructed line of sight in both directions. Any obstruction on the verge both sides of the access must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.6 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. The splay areas must thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstructions.

Reason: to ensure that a vehicle can see or be seen when exiting the access.

10. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised the turning/manoeuvring and parking shown on Drawing Number A/3358/04 must have been constructed. Thereafter, these areas, must be permanently maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site and to ensure that highway safety is not adversely impacted upon.

11. Before the development is occupied or utilised the first 5.00 metres of the vehicle access, measured from the rear edge of the highway (excluding the vehicle crossing - see the Page 26 Informative Note below), must be laid out and constructed to a specification submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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.

12. Prior to development above damp proof course level, details (including colour photographs) of all external facing materials for the wall(s) and roof(s) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as have been agreed.

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

13. 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 maintenance and replacement as necessary of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 5 years. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification) no enlargement(s) of the dwellinghouse hereby approved, permitted by Class A and Class B of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order, shall be erected or constructed. Reason: To protect amenity and the character of the area.

15. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting 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.

Informative Notes:

1. As the works affects a Council maintained structural asset the applicant should contact the Bridge and Structures Team by telephone at 01305 225366 or by email at j.burridge@dorsetcc.gov.uk, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the structural asset in question, to ensure that the appropriate licence(s) and or permission(s) are obtained.

2. These garages may contain asbestos. It is recommended the developer submits a detailed plan for the removal of asbestos that could be, Crocidolite asbestos, also known as blue asbestos, or Amosite asbestos otherwise known as brown asbestos. This will require specialists to remove this type of asbestos providing this is found in the building. Page 27 The more common will be Chrysotile asbestos or white asbestos which can be removed by non-specialists but will still need to be disposed of in a safe manner.

3. The vehicle crossing serving this proposal (that is, the area of highway land between the nearside carriageway edge and the site's road boundary) must be constructed to the specification of the Highway Authority in order to comply with Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant should contact Dorset Highways by telephone at 01305 221020, by email at dorsethighways@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Dorset Highways, Dorset

Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the public highway.

4. The applicant is advised that prior to the development being brought into use, it must comply with the requirements of Building Regulations Approved Document S: Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles.

5. 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. In this case: - The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer. - The applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

Application Reference: P/FUL/2023/01247

Application Site: 10 High East Street Dorchester DT1 1HS

Proposal: Erect first floor extension to provide 1 No. unit of residential accommodation

Recommendation: Grant, subject to the 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: 12673-01 Location Plan.pdf 12673-02 A Existing Plans, Elevations & Sections.pdf 12673 - 106 G Proposed plans and elevations Dec 2024 12673-107 Existing and Proposed Rear Elevations 12673-108 C Lobby Section Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. Page 44

3. No development shall commence until the necessary nutrient mitigation credits to mitigate the impacts of the development on the Poole Harbour Catchment have been secured from an accredited nutrient provider and a copy of the Nutrient Credit Certificate demonstrating that purchase, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient mitigation is provided against any impact which may arise from the development on the Poole Harbour.

4. Prior to construction of the extension hereby approved, a detailed method statement detailing abutment and construction methodology to include details of (but not limited to) tying in/connections with adjacent buildings, surface water drainage, rainwater goods, conservation of vents and flues shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the development and protecting adjacent heritage assets.

5. Before the development hereby approved commences a Construction Method Statement (CMS) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The CMS must include: - the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors - loading and unloading of plant and materials - storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development - delivery, demolition and construction working hours. The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

Reason: To minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network.

6. Prior to installation of first floor extension brickwork, a sample panel of the proposed external facing material measuring at least 1 metre by 1 metres, demonstrating the proposed brick, coursing, mortar mix and pointing detail, shall be erected on site, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with details of the sample panel as have been agreed.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development and in the interests of the heritage asset.

7. Prior to installation of new pitched roof, details and samples of all external facing materials for the wall(s) and roof(s) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as have been agreed.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development and in the interests of the heritage assets.

8. Prior to the installation of new external windows, detailed drawings (at a scale of 1:5 section and 1:20 elevation) showing the design, materials, colour, finish and construction specifications of all new windows (and passageway door if proposed) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the locality and in the interests of the appearance of the development and in the interests of the heritage asset.

9. Before installation of any extraction plant and associated ductwork, vents and flues, details of equipment, methodology, installation details, operating procedure and a management and maintenance schedule shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The extract system must be designed in accordance with the recommendations contained in reports prepared by Impact Acoustics and Greenavon, and details outlining mitigation to prevent loss of amenity and prevent creeping noise & odour levels for neighbouring residents and occupants of the new flat must be provided. Thereafter, the installation of the equipment must proceed fully in strict accordance with the agreed details prior to the development hereby approved being first occupied or brought into use, and subject thereafter to routine maintenance and cleansing in accordance with the agreed details and manufacturers' instructions.

Reason: In order to protect the living conditions of surrounding residential properties.

10. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, one No bird box and one No bat box shall be installed in accordance with recommendations contained in Abbas Ecology PRA and thereafter maintained in perpetuity. Reason: to provide biodiversity enhancements

11. Details of measures to limit the potential consumption of wholesome water use by persons occupying the new dwelling to 110 litres per person per day as measured in accordance with regulation 36 of the Approved Document for Part G2 of the Building Regulations 2010 (or any equivalent regulation revoking and/or re-enacting that Statutory Instrument) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the dwelling is occupied. The submitted details shall include a water consumption calculation for the dwelling in accordance with the Approved Documents referred to above. The approved measures shall be implemented and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority thereafter.

Reason: To secure nutrient neutrality through effective mitigation in the interests of protected Habitat Sites.

Decision: To refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below:

Reasons for refusals:

The proposal would lead to a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of 10A High East Street due to inadequate daylight to the living space of the adjacent property due to the proximity height and design of the proposed development, contrary to Policy ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

The proposal would lead to a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of 5 Icen Mews due to overbearing and overshadowing of the garden area of the adjacent property due to the proximity height and design of the proposed

development, contrary to Policy ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

The proposal due to its size and layout would fail to make sufficient provision for bin stores, recycling facilities, drying areas, cycle parking, mobility scooter storage and private amenity/garden space and associated storage and composting facilities, which would adversely impact on the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed residential unit, contrary to policy ENV.11 and ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

Application Reference: P/LBC/2023/01251

Application Site: 10 High East Street Dorchester DT1 1HS

Proposal: Erect first floor extension to provide 1 No. unit of residential accommodation

Recommendation: Grant listed building consent subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report.

Decision: To grant planning with the following conditions and reasons:

1. The work to which this listed building consent relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the consent is granted. Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by reason of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended). 2. The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 12673-01 Location Plan.pdf 12673-02 A Existing Plans, Elevations & Sections.pdf 12673 - 106 Proposed plans and elevations 12673 - 106 G Proposed plans and elevations 12673 - 107 Existing and Proposed Rear Elevations 12673 - 108 C Lobby Section.

Reason: To preserve the architectural and historical qualities of the building.

3. Prior to construction of the extension hereby approved, a detailed method statement detailing abutment and construction methodology to include details of (but not limited to) tying in/connections with adjacent buildings, surface water drainage, rainwater goods, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of protecting adjacent heritage assets

4. Prior to installation of first floor extension brickwork, a sample panel of the proposed external facing material measuring at least 1 metre by 1 metres, demonstrating the proposed brick, coursing, mortar mix and pointing detail, shall be

erected on site, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with details of the sample panel as have been agreed.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development and in the interests of the heritage asset.

5. Prior to installation of new pitched roof, details and samples of all external facing materials for the wall(s) and roof(s) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as have been agreed.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development and in the interests of the heritage assets

6. Prior to the installation of new external windows, detailed drawings (at a scale of 1:5 section and 1:20 elevation) showing the design, materials, colour, finish and construction specifications of all new windows (and passageway door if proposed) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the locality and in the interests of the appearance of the development and in the interests of the heritage asset.

7. Prior to installation of any works to facilitate a new entrance lobby, a method statement including detailed annotated section drawings showing construction method, materials, details of abutment(s) and joinery details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall proceed in strict accordance with the details as agreed.

Reason: In the interests of the heritage asset

8. No plumbing pipes or other services (other than those shown on the approved drawings) shall be located on the exterior of the building(s).

Reason: To preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the heritage asset.

Informative Notes:

1. Please ensure all conditions with regards to linked planning application ref P/FUL/2023/01247 are submitted and discharged, and thereafter works proceed in accordance with the agreed details as approved

2. 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. In this case: - The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer. - The applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

Application Reference: P/HOU/2024/06120

Application Site: Sunnydale White Lackington Piddletrenthide DT2 7QU

Proposal: Demolish store and erect a two Bay Garage / Workshop.

Recommendation: Grant, subject to conditions

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

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: 23/026/01 Location Plan 23/026/03 Proposed Block Plan 23/026/04 Existing Elevations/Floor Plans 23/026/05 Proposed Elevations/Floor Plans.

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

3. The development hereby approved shall proceed only in accordance with the details set out in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement by NB Tree Management Arboricultural Consultancy ref: Sunnydale– 29.5.25 date: 29th May 2025, setting out how the existing trees are to be protected and managed before, during and after development.

Reason: To ensure thorough consideration of the impacts of development on the existing trees.

4. The proposed car port shown on Drawing Number 23/026/05 Rev C hereby approved once constructed shall be maintained and available for the purpose of parking a motor vehicle. It shall not be converted to a use other than as a garage for the purpose of parking a motor vehicle by the provision of doors and/or walled enclosure.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory on-site parking is provided in a form that allows a vehicle to freely turn within the site curtilage

5. The detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement strategy set out within the approved Biodiversity Plan, certified by the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team on 14/01/2025, must be strictly adhered to during the carrying out of the development. The development hereby approved must not be first brought into use unless and until: i) the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed in the approved Biodiversity Plan have been completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable. ii) evidence of compliance, including photographic evidence, in accordance with section J of the approved Biodiversity Plan has been supplied to the Local Planning Authority prior to the substantial completion, or the first bringing into use of the development hereby approved, whichever is the sooner. The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Plan and 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.

Informative Notes: 1. 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. In this case: - The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer. -The application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

This page is intentionally left blank