

## **WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 4 AUGUST 2022**

**Present:** Cllrs Dave Bolwell, Kelvin Clayton, Susan Cocking, Jean Dunseith, Nick Ireland, Louie O'Leary, Paul Kimber, Bill Pipe (Vice-Chairman), David Shortell (Chairman), Sarah Williams, Kate Wheller and John Worth

**Apologies:** -

**Also present:** Cllr David Walsh – Portfolio Holder for Planning, Cllr Rebecca Knox – Ward Member for Beaminster

**Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):** Mike Garrity (Head of Planning), Anna Lee (Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement), James Lytton-Trevers (Lead Project Officer), Charlotte Loveridge (Planning Officer), Robert Parr (Planning Officer) Steven Banks (Planning Officer), Phil Crowther (Legal Business Partner – Regulatory), Emma Telford (Senior Planning Officer) Ann Collins (Area Manager – Western and Southern Team) and John Miles (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice) and David Northover (Democratic Services Officer)

**Public speakers:**

Cllr Paul Hartmann, Symondsburry Parish Council; Kathryn Pennington, Vistry Partnerships; David Matthews, Barratt David Wilson Homes; Barry Bates, John Guy, Gavin Fryer, Mr Summerton and John Grantham, local residents; Guy Dickenson, Chairman of West Dorset CPRE – all minute 28  
Richard Smith, a member of the Parnham planning response group; Ed Grant for applicant; and Cllr Chris Turner, of Beaminster Town Council – all minute 33.

**23. Apologies**

No apologies for absence were received at the meeting.

**24. Declarations of Interest**

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

Cllr Bill Pipe informed the Committee that, owing to an association he had with a client who had objected to the Foundry Lea application, he would take no part in the consideration, debate or vote of that particular item.

**25. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2022 were confirmed and signed.

**26. 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.

**27. Planning Applications**

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

**28. P/RES/2021/04848- Development of land at Foundry Lea (Vearse Farm), Bridport**

Prior to consideration of the item, the Chairman sought a Vice-Chairman for this given that the Vice-Chairman, Cllr Bill Pipe, was unable to take part owing to his association with a client who had objected to the application. On that basis, Cllr Susan Cocking proposed Jon Worth - this being seconded by Cllr Louis O'Leary. There being no further nominations, Cllr Jon Worth was appointed as Vice-Chairman for the item.

The Committee considered application P/RES/2021/04848 for the construction of 760 dwellings, public open space (including play space and landscape planting), allotments, an orchard, sports pitch provision, with associated changing rooms and car parking, pedestrian, cycle and vehicular links, drainage works and associated infrastructure in the development of land at Foundry Lea (Vearse Farm), Bridport. This was a Reserved Matters application to determine appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, following the grant of Outline Planning Permission (OPP) - number WD/D/17/000986. How any decision made would be enacted and the reasons for this was also explained.

Officers drew the attention of the Committee to the planning history of the site, in that OPP had been granted by the former West Dorset District Council in 2017. Accordingly, it was confirmed, and emphasised, that this application sought approval for the Reserved Matters pursuant to the OPP permission and should be the focus of the Committee's considerations.

With the aid of a visual presentation – and taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet circulated to members prior to the meeting - officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how these were to be progressed; how the development would contribute to meeting housing needs; and what this

entailed. The presentation took into account the policies against which this application was being assessed, - in complying with the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan, the Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – and particularly how it accorded with the junction layout, parameter, green infrastructure, scale & density plans approved with the OPP that were derived from a Masterplan for the scheme.

The Committee were informed that as the principle of the development had been deemed acceptable, it was solely now the Reserved Matters that were for consideration:

- principle,
- appearance,
- landscaping,
- layout – housing/ community infrastructure; roads, footpaths and cycleways; foul and surface water drainage; affordable housing and self build
- scale

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of the location, orientation, density, dimensions – form, bulk, size and mass - and appearance of the development and of the individual properties, with examples being given of how typical properties would be designed within the five distinctive character areas, along with their ground floor plans; how it would look; proposed street scenes; the materials to be used; energy efficiency enhancements; affordable housing provision; self-build provision; access and highway considerations; infrastructure and amenity considerations and provision; environmental and biodiversity considerations; the means of landscaping; and its setting within that part of the Bridport area - which was incorporated within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. What financial and amenity benefits there were to be under the S106 agreements and that there would be provision of a roundabout as part of the enhancement works on the A35 at the Miles Cross junction were explained.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development in Bridport and Vearse Farm itself - in how that, and the Toll House, would be accommodated within the scheme. The characteristics and topography of the site was shown and its relationship with the highway network and to properties in the adjoining roads in particular. Views into the site and around it were shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary. How the development was to be divided between 2021 and 2025 building regulations, and the reasons for this, was explained.

Whilst this application was for the residential development only, mention was also made that separate and subsequent applications were likely to be made in respect of the employment development and school that had been provided for in the Outline permission.

In summary, officers planning assessment adjudged the proposed development to be of an appropriate appearance, layout, landscaping and scale and that issues and concerns that had previously been identified had

since been addressed and, in there being no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application, this formed the basis of the officer's recommendation in seeking approval of the application.

As part of the consideration of the merits of the application, Councillor Paul Kimber requested a site visit be held on the grounds that the Committee should see at first-hand how the layout of the site would look and how highway issues could be addressed, so as to have a better understanding in coming to their decision. Calls for a site visit were supported by Councillor Jean Dunseith. The Solicitor outlined the protocol for the requirement of a site visit and asked for reasons why those proposing and seconding it thought it necessary. He felt that the reasons raised had already been addressed satisfactorily and that there would otherwise be little benefit in arranging this at this stage. On that basis – and on being put to the vote - the Committee also did not feel this to be necessary, considering that they already had enough information to be able to come to a decision.

Formal consultation on the application had seen a neutral stance from Bridport Town Council and Symondsburry Parish Council, whilst Char Valley Parish Council made comment. However, Allington Parish Council had objected on highways and access, infrastructure and overdevelopment grounds.

The Committee then received public representations.

Barry Bates, resident, felt that a number of issues had not been sufficiently addressed and that the development was being expedited unnecessarily. He asked that there be an independent assessment for sewage and the detailed plans to be agreed, as well as how the roundabout construction traffic would be managed.

John Guy, resident, considered that the S106 infrastructure and amenity – school, care home, employment land - should all be in place before the development took place so as that provision would be readily available from the start.

John Grantham, resident, considered the scheme should not be using productive farmland for the development and should have more energy efficient provision from the start. Given the expected increase in growth to Bridport in attracting visitors, the scheme would have insufficient infrastructure to cope. He also considered pedestrian provision access from the north to be compromised and suggested a site visit to see this at first hand.

Mr Summerton considered the scheme should be more environmentally friendly and energy efficient too and that the energy infrastructure would find it challenging to bear this extra load.

Gavin Fryer raised concerns at how environmental considerations would be addressed and that flooding and water management had not been taken into account enough. As there was still uncertainty over infrastructure and other outstanding material considerations to be determined, he considered that the application should be deferred until these were resolved.

Guy Dickenson, Chairman of West Dorset CPRE, considered the way the development of housing was being divided between 2021 and 2025 building regulations meant that full advantage was not being taken of energy efficiencies and environmental opportunities. Moreover, the needs of the AONB were being compromised.

Catherine Pennington, for one of the applicants, emphasised the collaboration with all those involved in the project, local residents included, had been much appreciated by the applicants who were now in a position to deliver this much needed scheme: designed to contribute considerable direct and indirect benefits to the economy. Issues raised previously had now had the opportunity to be addressed satisfactorily, with there now being the provision of 206 affordable homes, which was in excess of the Section 106 requirements. Key additional benefits within the section 106 were emphasised including environmental, energy efficiency and ecological and biodiversity gains. She assured the Committee that the applicants would continue to work collaboratively with local authorities and the community post any planning decision.

David Mathews on behalf of landowner Philip Kerr, confirmed that the responsibility of servicing the needs of the land was taken seriously, in understanding the engagement processes, so as to meet those obligations.

Cllr Paul Hartmann, Symondsburry Parish Council, whilst recognising there was no perfect solution, considered the application to be as good as it could be, in addressing concerns raised and in providing housing, environmental and infrastructure enhancements, although he hoped there could be a fully integrated development in time which took account of the development already there in Bridport so that this site became integral to and complemented Bridport, rather than being self-contained. He was pleased to see that a successful local solution had been developed that would contribute positively to Bridport.

Whilst recognising that this application had become notably contentious over a number of years, having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

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

- access and highway safety considerations and how these had been assessed and evaluated
- what prospect there was for even greater enhanced energy efficacy provision, such as more PV solar panels and ground source heat pumps, electricity charging points for vehicles; and rainwater collection, being disappointed at what traditional fossil fuel proposals there still were

- how the outstanding S106 issues would be addressed by the applicant and what assurance there was that these would be delivered satisfactorily as proposed
- how the energy generation and provision – electricity and water – to serve such a major development would be able to be achieved satisfactorily and what, assessments and assurances there were from energy companies that this could be delivered as necessary
- what impact the development would have on existing infrastructure and amenity and how this would be managed

The three local Ward members served on the Committee – Cllrs Dave Bolwell, Sarah Williams and Kelvin Clayton and the issues they raised individually were part of the considerations and clarifications set out above

Officers confirmed that much of the context of the objections and issues raised related to aspects of the already agreed OPP – the opportunity for which to consider had since passed – and reiterated that, it was the Reserved Matters that should be the sole focus for Committee. Highway officers confirmed too that the scheme had been fully assessed and evaluated, with mitigation as necessary to address the concerns raised. Again, moreover, all highway considerations – movements; flows; congestion and safety - had been established at the outline stage.

Officers addressed the questions raised providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable.

The Solicitor advised that any conditions requiring renewable energy measures required a policy basis and that it was a matter for members to determine the weight to be given to the Council's emerging policy on this.

From debate, whilst a number of the Committee would have preferred to see greater more environmental and highway enhancements, they understood that much of this had already been determined at the outline stage and that - in focusing on the Reserved Matters only - this had to be seen to be acceptable and there were no grounds for refusal on that basis. They accepted that the housing provision would contribute significantly towards meeting the residential needs of Bridport and targets set by the Council.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application, having understood what was being proposed and the reasoning for this; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation, the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, and having received satisfactory answers to questions raised, the Committee were satisfied in their understanding of what the proposal entailed and the reasoning for this and, on that basis - and being proposed by Councillor Susan Cocking and seconded by Councillor John Worth - on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed - by 8:2 - with one abstention, that the application should be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the paragraph of the report the provisions of the Update Sheet and taking into account the issues raised by committee that were pertinent to this application.

## **Resolved**

That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement for the approval of reserved matters, subject to the discharge of any outstanding conditions on the outline planning permission (WD/D/17/000986) which are required to be discharged prior to the approval of the reserved matters (conditions 2 for the phasing, 6 for a Design Code, 7 for the LEMP, 38 for the road crossings over the river and 39 for floor levels of the dwellings) and subject to conditions as set out in this report - and in the Update Sheet - with the relevant plan number and revision number to be entered in conditions no. 2, 3 and 4.

Reasons	for	Decision
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposed development was considered to be of an appropriate appearance, layout and scale, with appropriate landscaping incorporated. As such, the proposed development was considered to be in accordance with local and national policy objectives.</li><li>• The appearance of the housing, with five distinctive character areas, would respond to the appearance of housing in Bridport.</li><li>• The layout of the housing, community infrastructure, movement network, drainage and affordable housing would meet the requirements necessary for the scheme to function and integrate with Bridport.</li><li>• The landscaping would conserve and enhance the AONB, biodiversity and existing trees and hedges and provide appropriate new planting.</li><li>• The scale would be appropriate to the characteristics of the site including the lie of the land and location within it.</li><li>• The proposal would comply with the West Dorset, Weymouth &amp; Portland Local Plan, the Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</li><li>• Paragraph 11 of the NPPF set out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise.</li><li>• There were no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.</li></ul>		

### **29. P/FUL/2022/02646- Greenford Church of England Primary School**

The Committee considered an application for the site of a timber lodge classroom within the grounds of Greenford Church of England Primary School, Chilfrome Lane, Maiden Newton.

The planning officer's presentation - in taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet circulated to members prior to the meeting - outlined the site location, the conservation area, and that the application is located on Dorset Council freehold land.

The officer highlighted the planning history, the appearance of the timber structure, the view from the school gates from Chilfrome Lane, the main issues being that it was close to the Maiden Newton conservation area and being within the Dorset AONB, and the officer also covered the principle of

development. She made the committee aware of the economic and educational benefits of additional learning space and the minimal flood risk.

The committee was informed that there would be minimal impact on character and appearance of the site. The dimensions of the timber structure were described too.

Cllr Paul Kimber asked if there were toilets in the structure.

The officer clarified that there were no toilets there and that the space would provide additional shelter in all weather.

Proposed by Cllr Paul Kimber, seconded by Cllr Susan Cocking

**Resolved**

That application P/FUL/2022/02646 be granted permission subject to the conditions set out in the report, and in taking account of the provisions of the Update Sheet, as necessary.

**30. P/FUL/2022/02955- Scout Hall Granby Close Weymouth**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of an extension to provide wheelchair accessible WC and Shower facilities to the site at Scout Hall Granby Close Weymouth.

The officer explained that the application was on behalf of Weymouth West Air Scout Group located on Council owned land.

The officer - in taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet circulated to members prior to the meeting - informed that the site was located on the boundary of western Chickerell ward and was in a low flood risk zone. The presentation showed an arial shot of the site shown and other photographs, covering the relevant planning history, existing plans, elevations, the site plan proposed and key planning issues and principles of development.

It was made known that the design was in harmony with existing buildings and in keeping with site and area. The planning officer recommended to grant the application subject to conditions.

Proposed by Cllr John Worth, seconded Cllr Jean Dunseith

**Resolved**

That application P/FUL/2022/02955 be granted planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and in taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet circulated to members prior to the meeting.

**31. P/LBC/2022/02381- 4 Bedford Terrace, Long Bredy**



The Committee considered an application to carry out internal and external alterations at 4 Bedford Terrace, Long Bredy. The application came to committee due to the applicant residing with a planning officer.

Internal and external alterations told to the committee involved refurbishing of windows, installation of extractor fan, double glazing, wiring; a nib; draft proofing between joists; partitions; plumbing and drainage and wardrobes. Internal alterations also included the removal of a cupboard, the repair of ceilings and the relocation of a ceiling hatch.

In taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet, circulated to members prior to the meeting, officers summarised the plans of installations, the front renovations, photos of bedroom 1, 2, 3, kitchen, living room, front elevation, and rear elevation.

It was also discussed that the installations would have limited impact on the historic fabric of the listed building and would cause less than substantial harm and allow a good standard of repair.

The officer recommended to grant, subject to conditions, as proposed works would cause less than substantial harm to the designated heritage assets, the public benefits outweighed the harm and provided a modern living standard and ensured long-term visibility of the designated heritage assets as a dwelling.

Proposed by Cllr Dunseith, seconded by Cllr Paul Kimber

### **Resolved**

That application P/LBC/2022/02381 be granted planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and in taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet circulated to members prior to the meeting.

## **32. P/FUL/2021/02707 - Parnham Estate Parnham Beaminster**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a marquee and provision of a services structure (back of house) to function as a restaurant, as well as the provision of a 49-space car park and associated driveway improvements at Parnham Estate, Parnham, Beaminster.

The presentation - in taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet circulated to members prior to the meeting - covered rights of way/bridleway, aerial photographs, maps of the site, photos of the location and car park, the proposed car park, the elevations of the proposed marquee, the material that the marquee would be constructed of, and other key planning issues such as, noise report being reviewed, heritage assets, residential amenity, AONB highway safety, biodiversity and flood risk.

It was also discussed that the marquee would be located in flood zone 1 which is low risk and the car park in flood risk 2 and 3, considered high.

The site had a Grade 1 listed stable block; the garden walls being grade 2 listed. The committee was made aware that Parnham Estate suffered severe fire damage with the loss of its roof and extensive renovation was needed. The presentation told that the new owner's commitment showed that repairs were taking place to parts of the house, but additional sources of revenue were needed to fund the cost of renovations.

Planting would be conducted around the car park and that parking would be broken up with planting. The Highways Team had no objections with using the northern entrance.

The officer recommended to grant subject to the commission of a robust noise assessment, to be reviewed by environmental health.

The project manager of the estate spoke about the need to create a sustainable and sensible business. He also added that the facilities - and restaurants - would be used to host weddings and events and would help to fund the maintenance of the estate. He also mentioned that all local residents could enjoy the restaurant and the estate which would have the scope to provide employment and training in the area.

Rebecca Knox supported the application by telling the committee that it was a very important estate near Beaminster of which the residents were very proud. She reiterated that the house needed a lot of work and that local people had been informed and included in the plans of the application. She ended that she hoped Dorset Council would play its part.

There were questions asked regarding the colour of the marquee and if this would be restricted.

The planning officer clarified that the marquee would be in cream, but these details need to be submitted and agreed.

Proposed by Cllr Paul Kimber, seconded by Cllr Bill Pipe

### **Resolved**

That application P/FUL/2021/02707 be granted planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and in taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet, as necessary.

### **33. P/FUL/2021/05746- Parnham Estate Parnham Beaminster**

The Committee considered an application to erect six orchard rooms and the installation of two bridges at Parnham Estate, Parnham, Beaminster. The six orchard rooms would be six units of holiday accommodation and have 1 bed and 1 bathroom.

The planning officer's presentation - in taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet circulated to members prior to the meeting - showed a map of the local area, how the holiday accommodation would look, bridge's location, the street scene and how the orchard rooms would be separated and

oriented, as well as dimensions and floor plans parking spaces within the car parking area and the key planning issues and the principle of development.

The officer added that the site would be accessed from the northern entrance and that two units of the orchard rooms would be located in the existing fruit orchard on the opposite side of river. The committee was told that there would be outside baths and the inspiration for the orchard rooms was taken from beehives. It was also made known that the rooms will be built from timber cladding with steel roofs and bridges constructed of oak.

The Public benefits were outlined: as additional income for the estate and increased public access to a heritage asset. These benefits considered to outweigh potential harm and being in a relatively discreet location, highways raised no objection, with a low flood risk (flood zone 1 but foot bridges in flood zone 3).

It was also made aware that Parnham House was located outside the DDB but policy allowed for tourism development. The development had been determined to have less than substantial harm to the icehouse structure.

An oral update was given regarding the plans list condition. On the update sheet it relates to two proposed locations plans as "rev b" and a proposed site plan as "rev d" but should be "rev a" for both location plans and "rev b" for the proposed site plan.

The Chairman confirmed with the committee that they had read the update sheets, as the application had two recommendations which were amended, and conditions updated.

The conditions were outlined for landscaping, flood risk assessment, evacuation plan, flood warning and biodiversity plan.

Richard Smith a member of the Parnham planning response group was invited to address the committee and raised points on their behalf. He acknowledged the attempt to create a new hotel and lodge accommodation with benefits for employment and commerce. He informed of the shortcomings such as, the planning statement had no clear written vision or timescale on restoration and development, the business plan was short on financial detail, a lack of a masterplan, no local consultation with residents and rejection by historic England.

He requested a restriction to the house being sold separately and a legally binding agreement to restore the house.

Ed Grant addressed the committee about Parnham House being in a desperate state and the need to establish a business. He mentioned that the orchard rooms had been designed to fit in with the environment and were sustainable with minimal environmental impacts and added that the orchard's yields were undesirable and would be more successful being planted elsewhere.

Cllr Chris Turner, of Beaminster Town Council, addressed the Committee and made comments about the two applications. He informed the Committee about planning and the long-term considerations, the A3066 northern entrance and a 30-mph speed limit needed to be drawn south away from Beaminster by 200-300 meters which would—reduce the speed for those accessing Parnham estate. He stated that a traffic regulation order needed to be implemented before entertainment was granted.

Cllr Rebecca Knox, the Ward member, addressed the committee and made the committee aware of the scale of investment, work in the owner's being committed to the restoration of the house and participation from local businesses.

The planning officer responded and was given the opportunity to clarify any points.

She clarified that the proposal was acceptable under the S106 agreement which was the intensification of the existing overnight accommodation already at Parnham estate and included in the west wing, butler's apartment, and dower house. The officer then went on to clarify the benefits of a master plan, but that the application could not be refused on the lack of a master plan.

Steve Savage, Transport Development Liaison Manager, addressed the highway issues that were raised: speed data, speed limits, vehicle speeds, explaining the applicant's vision on scale and size of the visibility displays required and that there was no justification for extending the speed limit.

Cllr Kate Wheller asked questions regarding the colour and nature of the roofs on the pods. Cllr Paul Kimber asked a technical question regarding the replanting of trees in the orchard. Cllr Bill Pipe asked questions of the opening schedule for the ice house and why is it not open for longer.

The senior planning officer provided clarification on all of these issues, particularly that the limitations on the icehouse openings was due to the security of the estate.

Proposed by Kate Wheller, seconded by Susan Cocking

### **Resolved**

That application P/FUL/2021/05746 be granted planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and in taking into account the provisions of the Update Sheet, as necessary.

#### **34. Urgent items**

There were no urgent items for consideration.

#### **35. Exempt Business**

There was no requirement for exempt business.

36. **Update Sheet**

37. **Update Sheet**

**Planning Committee – Update Sheet  
Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> August 2022**

**Planning Applications**

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
P/RES/2022/04848	Foundry Lea Bridport	Item 6	13-89
<p>Updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant is stated as Barratt David Wilson Homes. There are however, two Applicants as follows: Barratt David Wilson Homes and Vistry Partnerships.</li> <li>Consultee: Outdoor recreation - further comments that do not raise new issues and suggest conditions which already exist in similar form on the outline permission.</li> <li>Consultee: Wessex Water – Support the JRC Foul Drainage Statement (ref 1628w0006) 26<sup>th</sup> July 2022 which reflects the current foul drainage strategy for the site.</li> <li>Consultee: Environment Agency – The Environment Agency has submitted a comment in response to the submissions by the applicant to discharge some of the conditions attached to the outline planning permission. The full response can be viewed on the website under the planning application reference WD/D/17/000986. In summary the EA do not recommend the discharge of conditions 38 and 39 and therefore do not recommend the reserved matters application be approved at this time. They advise that to progress things the applicant should provide any additional supporting modelling that has been compiled along with a comprehensive modelling report and FRA addendum.</li> </ul> <p>This response to the application for the discharge of conditions is relevant in so far as officers are recommending that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement for the approval of the reserved matters application, subject to the prior discharge of certain conditions, including conditions 38 and 39. At this stage, it is anticipated that the discharge of conditions 38 and 39 will be resolved through ongoing dialogue between officers, the EA and the applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional 1 letter of support from the Symondsburry Estate - The employment land is not sold to a developer, but is held as a development opportunity for the Estate and will aim to bring about a high quality scheme to ensure that the entrance to the town and Symondsburry from the west is attractive, lasting and good for the community. The Estate has entered into a binding contract with the residential developers for them to provide the relevant infrastructure and liaise so that land and or buildings can be delivered to market in line with planning consent. There are strong enquiries for occupiers in the locality and wider afield and the Estate needs to take time to assimilate and plan carefully. The Estate looks forward to seeing the current detailed application come to fruition so in turn commercially viable projects can mature and be delivered on the employment land when the time is right.</li> </ul>			

- Additional 1 letter of objection which raises points that are already addressed in the committee report.

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
P/FUL/2022/02646	Greenford Church Of England Primary School, Chilfrome Lane, Maiden Newton, Dorchester, DT2 0AX	7.	91-100

#### Recommendation

That the Committee be minded to grant consent subject to conditions. ~~and subject to there being as there has been no adverse comment received from the freeholder on the lapse of the 21 days notice (19 July 2022) served on them by the applicant.~~

And the following conditions:

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:

Site Plan  
Front & side view 1  
Front & side view 2  
Front & side view 3  
Front & side view 4  
Floorplan/Layout  
Door & Window technical dimensions

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

3. The building hereby approved shall be used as a classroom/ancillary building to the educational facility known as Greenford Church of England Primary School only and for no other purpose.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning.

- ~~4. The timber building hereby approved shall be left to silver naturally and no paint/stain shall be applied to the timber walls (except for windows/doors that will be painted black). Thereafter, the building shall be retained as such.~~

~~Reason: In the interests of visual amenity within the AONB & the visual setting of the Maiden Newton Conservation Area.~~

4. The timber building hereby approved shall only be treated with clear, protective wood preservatives in order to retain the natural timber colour (except for windows/doors that will be painted black). Thereafter, the building shall be retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity within the AONB & the visual setting of the Maiden Newton Conservation Area.

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
P/LBC/2022/02381	4 Bedford Terrace Long Bredy Dorset DT2 9HW	9.	109-114

#### Ecology

A member of the Natural Environment Team, in an email of 05/05/2022, confirmed that, due to the nature of the proposed works, a bat survey does not need to be completed by the applicant.

The applicant has stated that a bat survey, which confirmed an absence of bats, has been completed. This survey does not form part of this application given the comments of the Natural Environment Team.

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
P/FUL/2021/02707	Parnham Estate, Parnham, Beaminster.	10.	115-138

#### Recommendation:

Since the drafting of the committee report a Biodiversity Plan has been reviewed by the Natural Environment Team (NET) and a certificate of approval issued for the Biodiversity Plan by NET.

The recommendation will be amended as follows:

#### Recommendation A:

Delegate authority to the Head of Planning or the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement to grant subject to ~~the submission of a satisfactory Biodiversity Plan to be reviewed by the Natural Environment Team (NET) and the addition of any suitably worded conditions relating to it,~~ the submission of a robust noise assessment to be reviewed by Environmental Health and the addition of any suitably worded conditions relating to it, planning conditions as set out in this report and the completion of a legal agreement under

section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in a form to be agreed by the Legal Services Manager to secure the tying of the development to Parnham House ~~and Estate~~ so that it cannot be sold off separately.

An additional condition will therefore be added to the recommendation as follows:

20. Prior to commencement of any works relating to the car parking area a timetable for the implementation of the measures of the Biodiversity Plan shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed timetable and the approved Biodiversity Plan, dated 21/07/2022, and agreed by the Natural Environment Team on 26/07/2022, unless a subsequent variation is agreed in writing with the Council.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity.

Amendments to conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Proposed Location Plan – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-001 Rev A

Proposed Location Plan – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-000 Rev A

Restaurant Marquee Proposed Site Plan – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-003

Restaurant Marquee Proposed Ground Floor Plan – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-100-FI

Restaurant Marquee Proposed Elevations – North & South – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-200 Rev A

Restaurant Marquee Proposed Elevations – West & East – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-201 Rev A

Restaurant Marquee Proposed Ground Floor Plan – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-100

Restaurant Marquee Proposed Roof Plan – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-101

Parking Proposed Site Plan – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-002-PA Rev A

Proposed Parking Site Section – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-003-PA

Parking Proposed Finishes Plan – drawing number 101-A-B3-PR-002-FI Rev A

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

Additional Informative:

Informative: Building Control

The applicant needs to be aware that concerns have been raised by Building Control regarding fire brigade access, other options are available such as sprinklers but these will need to be investigated by the applicant and any solution would need to be agreed by the Fire Authority during consultation as part of the Building Control application.

Amendments/updates to officer's report:

The heritage section of the report is headed 'Visual Amenity and Heritage Assets' however the heritage impacts, including on setting are wider than only



visual impact and the planning assessment goes beyond visual impacts.

The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty section of the report sets out that the proposed marquee and car park are not considered to meet the threshold of major development in line with NPPF. It should also be noted that cumulatively the three current planning applications (two before committee and one still under consideration) are also not considered to meet the threshold of major development given the scale of the development proposed cumulatively within the context of Parnham House and its associated outbuildings and structures.

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
P/FUL/2021/05746	Parnham Estate, Parnham, Beaminster.	11.	139-162
<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Since the drafting of the committee report a Biodiversity Plan has been reviewed by the Natural Environment Team (NET) and a certificate of approval issued for the Biodiversity Plan by NET.</p> <p>The recommendation will be amended as follows:</p> <p>Recommendation A:</p> <p>Delegate authority to the Head of Planning or the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement to grant subject to the <del>submission of a satisfactory Biodiversity Plan to be reviewed by the Natural Environment Team (NET) and the addition of any suitably worded conditions relating to it,</del> planning conditions as set out in this report and the completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in a form to be agreed by the Legal Services Manager to secure the tying of the development to Parnham House so that it cannot be sold off separately.</p> <p>An additional condition will therefore be added to the recommendation as follows:</p> <p>19. Prior to commencement of development a timetable for the implementation of the measures of the Biodiversity Plan shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed timetable and the approved Biodiversity Plan, dated 21/07/2022, and agreed by the Natural Environment Team on 26/07/2022, unless a subsequent variation is agreed in writing with the Council.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of biodiversity.</p> <p>Amendments to conditions:</p> <p>1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p>			

Proposed Location Plan – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-002 Rev B  
 Proposed Location Plan – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-001 Rev B  
 Proposed Site Plan – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-003 Rev D  
 Proposed Site Elevation – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-004 Rev C  
 Proposed Site Section – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-005 Rev A  
 Proposed Ground Floor Plan – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-100 Rev A  
 Proposed Roof Plan – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-101 Rev A  
 Proposed Elevations – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-200 Rev A  
 Proposed Section A-A – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-300 Rev A  
 Proposed Bridge 01 – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-400 Rev A  
 Proposed Bridge 02 – drawing number 101-A-B16-PR-401 Rev B

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

9. Prior to the commencement of development, a construction method statement detailing how the ~~extent of the~~ Ice House structure will be ~~determined and~~ protected from any short or long term defects during the construction of the orchard rooms shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the construction shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed method statement.

Reason: To protect the designated heritage asset during construction.

10. Prior to first occupation of the orchard rooms hereby approved an Ice House Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall include the following:

- A commitment that the Ice House would be accessible to members of the public for 3 days of each calendar year;
- How details of the time and date of opening would be made available to the members of the public;
- Details of how the ~~That the~~ time and date of opening will be provided to the Council and when ~~it will be provided~~ these details will be provided in advance of opening;
- Details of how ~~How~~ access to the Ice House would be managed;
- Details of the path to be created to provide pedestrian access and its provision prior to the first open day;
- Information on the history of the Ice House including describing the construction and purpose and how this would be made available for those visiting.

The agreed management plan shall be implemented following first occupation of the orchard rooms and shall continue in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to allow increased public access to the Ice House to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused.

16. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (FRA) (Simpson tws, Issue 02 dated 14th March 2022) and the mitigation measures it details, including a minimum finished floor level of 43.80m

AOD for the Orchards Rooms and footbridge and no temporary or permanent ground raising on existing land below the FRA's estimated 1 in 100 year flood level of 43.20mAOD in order to ensure no loss of existing flood storage. Thereafter, the measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants and to prevent increasing flooding elsewhere by ensuring that the floodplain storage is maintained.

Additional Informative:

Informative: Building Control

The applicant needs to be aware that concerns have been raised by Building Control regarding fire brigade access, other options are available such as sprinklers but these will need to be investigated by the applicant and any solution would need to be agreed by the Fire Authority during consultation as part of the Building Control application.

Amendments/updates to officer's report:

The heritage section of the report is headed 'Visual Amenity and Heritage Assets' however the heritage impacts, including on setting are wider than only visual impact and the planning assessment goes beyond visual impacts.

The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty section of the report sets out that the proposed orchard rooms are not considered to meet the threshold of major development in line with NPPF. It should also be noted that cumulatively the three current planning applications (two before committee and one still under consideration) are also not considered to meet the threshold of major development given the scale of the development proposed cumulatively within the context of Parnham House and its associated outbuildings and structures.

Additional representation received:

An objection has been received which is summarised as follows:

An officer of the Council notified the applicants in September 2021 that holiday lets in this location would be contrary to policy and would be unlikely to be determined favourably unless they were specifically part of the wider enabling development project for the restoration of the house, which would enable the proposals to be assessed from this exceptional circumstance. The officer advised that the Council cannot permit enabling development wholesale or piecemeal without ensuring the restoration of Parnham is legally agreed. The objector states that there is nothing in the application under consideration suggesting that the holiday lets income stream will be for the restoration of Parnham house and considers as such, this application should be refused.

**Duration of meeting:** 10.00 am - 3.00 pm

**Chairman**

.....