

# Public Document Pack



## EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 7 SEPTEMBER 2022

**Present:** Cllrs Mike Barron, Toni Coombs (Chairman), Shane Bartlett (Vice-Chairman), Alex Brenton, Mike Dyer, Barry Goringe, David Morgan, Julie Robinson and David Tooke

**Apologies:** Cllrs Robin Cook, Bill Trite and John Worth

**Also present:** Cllr David Walsh

**Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):** Mike Garrity, Elizabeth Adams, Peter Walters, Steve Savage, Lucy Page, Sarah Barber, Phil Crowther and David Northover

#### 281. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Robin Cook, Bill Trite and John Worth.

#### 282. **Declarations of Interest**

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

#### 283. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2022 were confirmed.

#### 284. **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.

#### 285. **Planning Applications**

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

#### 286. **P/FUL/2022/03143 - Change of use from agricultural to 8 no. self-storage (B8 storage only) units at Walston Poultry Farm Ltd, Gaunt's Common, BH21 4JR**

The Committee considered application P/FUL/2022/03143 for the change of use from agricultural to 8 no. self-storage (B8 storage only) units at Walston Poultry Farm Ltd, Gaunt's Common, BH21 4JR.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how these were to be progressed; and what this change of use entailed. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on residential amenity, the highway network and the character the area, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of how the storage units were to be developed and how they would make use of the existing building there as a basis for what was to be developed, how it would look like and its dimensions – those specifications to be finalised at a later stage in liaison with officers; access and highway considerations; environmental and land management considerations – taking account of the Grade II Listed Building – Little Thatch, that it was adjacent to ancient woodland and to Holt and West Moors Heaths SSSI and was within the Green Belt; drainage and water management considerations, the means of landscaping and screening and the development's setting within that part of Gaunt's Common.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development, with the characteristics, topography and elevations of the site being shown. Views into the site and around it was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary. The site had previously been used as a poultry farm and what buildings were currently there and how they would be transformed and renovated to provide for the storage units was explained. The processes necessary for change of use was explained in detail too.

The previous planning history of the site was outlined explaining in what way a previous application refusal had now been addressed to make this application acceptable.

What assessment had been made in the officers coming to their recommendation were drawn to the attention of the Committee, with the proposal being considered to be acceptable in relation to previous issues now being addressed and that, although industrial estates were preferred locations for storage and distribution uses, there was satisfaction that the proposed re-use of existing buildings for 8 self-storage units could, in principle, be acceptable in this location provided that the requirements of policy PC4 'The Rural Economy' were met.

Moreover, the Highway Authority considered there to be no adverse highway implications given that there were currently no restrictions on the agricultural use of the site; the removal of movements associated with the existing agricultural use would be a general highway benefit; individual storage units were typically accessed by cars and light vans so the use by HGVs was

anticipated to reduce and that a condition to secure the manoeuvring, parking and loading areas be applied.

Officers adjudged that the benefits associated with the reuse of existing buildings for economic purposes, the reduction in ammonia and nitrogen emissions in close proximity to the SSSI, the removal of slow-moving farm traffic from the highways and the ability to control future use by the imposition of conditions weighed in favour of the application and that any permission could be satisfactorily controlled by condition so as to overcome the previous reasons for refusal and that, on balance, the application accorded with Local Plan and national planning policies when considered as a whole. Those assessments formed the basis of the officer's recommendation to refuse the application.

From formal consultation, Holt Parish Council had objected on the grounds that the enterprise was not appropriate for the rural parish and given the site constraints, there would inappropriate commercial activity due to HGV movements, increased traffic, noise and local disruption; there was a lack of suitable infrastructure and highways to support the use and road safety concerns and would have an adverse effect on residential amenity. The adjoining Parish Council of Hinton were concerned about traffic management in Gaunt's area.

The local Ward Member for Stour and Allen Vale, Cllr Robin Cook, considered that the proposal could have a considerable negative effect on the village and asked that it be refused.

Adam Bennett, local resident, considered the application to be given the highway considerations in such a constrained rural, residential area considering it to be an unsustainable enterprise in such a rural location and did not meet local need. There were currently no clear details of how the development would look or its size, layout or what parking arrangements there were to be. Given all this he considered the application should be refused.

Brett Spiller, for applicant, considered that the low impact use of redundant buildings to be of economic benefit with traffic issues not being a concern and outstanding issues having been addressed. The previous unfettered use had not given cause for concern and what was being proposed would be better regulated. In providing for improved amenity, he asked for the application to be approved.

Simon McCorkle, local resident, expressed concern at the highway and access issues he considered would be generated by this proposal and that, on that basis, the application should be refused.

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 then 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.

Some important points raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, were:-

- for what purposes would the units be used
- how frequently they would be used
- by whom would they be used – public or commercial
- what could and could not be stored there – a need for an informative note to account for this.
- how what was being stored there would be managed, monitored and regulated
- how traffic would be managed and the access and parking arrangements

Officers addressed the questions raised – and provided what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood. As to what could and could not be stored there, other agencies would regulate this, under licence and their own prescriptions.

From debate, the majority of the Committee considered the recommendation to not be acceptable on the grounds pertaining to the previous refusal - as set out in paragraph 15.1.1, 15.1.2 and 15.1.3 of the officers report : -

- being in an unsustainable location,
- insufficient information about the number and nature of future users or any way to reasonable way to control trip rates.
- notwithstanding the opportunity to control the hours of operation, the proposal is anticipated to result in harm to neighbouring amenity from increased vehicular trip rates associated with multiple storage units along the narrow access. However, some members considered the application to be acceptable as it would make best use of the existing buildings there and in light of no objection from the Highway's Officer.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representation; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor David Tooke and seconded by Councillor Mike Barron, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed - by 5:2 (with 1 abstention) - to refuse permission.

#### Resolved

That application P/FUL/2022/03143 be refused.

#### Reasons for Decision

Pertaining to the basis of the previous refusal under paragraph 15.1.1, 15.1.2 and 15.1.3 of the officer's report.

#### **287. P/FUL/2022/01864 - Kimmeridge Car Park, Kimmeridge Bay**

The Committee considered application P/FUL/2002/01864 for a seasonal change of use for parking of catering vehicles, providing a dining area and siting of associated temporary at Kimmeridge Car Park, Kimmeridge Bay.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of how the development was to look – including its design, dimensions, configuration and appearance; access and highway considerations; environmental and land management considerations; landscaping and screening issues; and the development's setting within that part of Kimmeridge. The development was design to create a number of jobs and contribution to the local economy

Particular environmental considerations and constraints were that the site was within the Purbeck Heritage Coast; near Grade II listed buildings; adjacent to UNESCO World Heritage Site; within the Dorset AONB; within a Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Area and had a series of Public Rights of Way across the site.

Officers showed the development's relationship with Kimmeridge, the coast, shoreline and countryside development, with the characteristics and topography of the site being shown, particularly the openness of the site. Views around the site were shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary. The site had previously been used for such purposes as being proposed but on a temporary basis.

The Landscape Officer particularly felt that the scale of the development and its duration would seriously compromise the openness and isolation of this environmentally sensitive and important area and adversely affect its attractiveness. There was no readily available screening measure which could be used to diminish its visual impact.

What assessment had been made in the officers coming to their recommendation were drawn to the attention of the Committee, with the proposal being considered to be unacceptable in relation to material planning considerations as the proposed development was considered to result in harm to the character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty by virtue of developing a piece of land in a sensitive location that was otherwise characterised by its isolation and openness. The benefit arising from the creation of part-time seasonal employment was not seen to be sufficient to outweigh the harm. These assessments formed the basis of the officer's recommendation to refuse the application.

The opportunity was provided for speakers to address the Committee.

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 then 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.

Some important points raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, were:-

- What would be the configuration of the site
- What would its footprint be
- What would be the tarpaulin
- how traffic would be managed and the access and parking arrangements

Officers addressed the questions raised – and provided what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood. As to what could and could not be stored there, other agencies would regulate this, under licence and their own prescriptions.

From debate, the majority of the Committee considered the proposal to be acceptable and would provide an economic benefit to the locality and Dorset in general and would provide a service that those visiting the bay might well expect and appreciate and have come to expect elsewhere.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representation; and what they had heard at the meeting, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed to grant permission subject to appropriate conditions - to be determined by officers with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

### **Resolved**

That planning application P/FUL/2022/01864 be granted permission subject to appropriate conditions - to be determined by officers with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

288. **P/FUL/2021/05633 - Sever land and erect a detached 3 bedroom chalet bungalow with associated vehicular access and parking at Old Oaks, Verwood**

The Committee considered application P/FUL/2021/05633 to sever land and erect a detached 3 bedroom chalet bungalow with associated vehicular access and parking at Old Oaks, Verwood.

What the proposal entailed and how this would be achieved was explained. What impact it would have on residential amenity was also taken into consideration. There was considered to be no adverse impact on the tree on site with construction work having mitigation measures to that effect.

From debate, the majority of the Committee considered the proposal to be acceptable.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representation; and what they had heard at the meeting, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed to grant permission subject to appropriate conditions set out in the report.

**Resolved**

That application P/FUL/2021/05633 be granted permission, subject to appropriate conditions set out in the report.

289. **P/FUL/2021/05535 - Change of use of verge to form part of residential curtilage. Erect detached carport and vehicular access between carport and adopted highway at Old Oaks, Verwood**

The Committee considered application P/FUL/2021/05535 for a change of use of verge to form part of residential curtilage and to erect a detached carport and vehicular access between carport and adopted highway at Old Oaks, Verwood.

What the proposal entailed and how this would be achieved was explained. What impact it would have on residential amenity was also taken into consideration. Again, there was considered to be no adverse impact on the tree on site with construction work having mitigation measures to that effect.

From debate, the majority of the Committee considered the proposal to be acceptable.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representation; and what they had heard at the meeting, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed to grant permission subject to appropriate conditions set out in the report.

**Resolved**

That application P/FUL/2021/05535 be granted permission, subject to appropriate conditions set out in the report.

290. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

291. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

**Duration of meeting:** 10.00 am - 2.00 pm

**Chairman**

.....