

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 7 MARCH 2023

Present: Cllrs Sherry Jespersen (Chairman), Mary Penfold (Vice-Chairman), Jon Andrews, Tim Cook, Les Fry, Brian Heatley, Carole Jones, Stella Jones, Emma Parker, Val Potheary and Belinda Ridout

Present remotely: Cllrs

Apologies: Cllrs

Also present:

Also present remotely:

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

Robert Lennis (Area Lead (Major Projects) Eastern), Hannah Smith (Planning Area Manager), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Steve Savage (Transport Development Manager), Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer), Joshua Kennedy (Apprentice Democratic Services Officer) and Simon Sharp (Senior Planning Officer)

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

149. **Apologies**

There were no apologies for absence.

150. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

151. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 24th January were confirmed and signed.

152. **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.

153. **Planning Applications**

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

154. **P/OUT/2021/05708- Land South of Three Acres Musbury Lane Marnhull, erection of 8 dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping**

The Case Officer presented to members the erection of up to 7 dwellings with associated access, parking, and landscaping (outline application to determine access only).

With the aid of visual representation, members were shown aerial photographs of the current and existing site as well as surrounding areas. Members were reminded that there was no settlement plan for Marnhull. Details regarding where the site would be situated, nearby existing dwellings as well as the proposed site access. Regarding access, members were informed that the road was at risk of surface water flooding whereas the elevated site wasn't. The Case Officer also informed members about the tree preservation order on any remaining trees on the site as well as providing detailed regarding attenuation of the site.

Steve Savage, Transport Development Manager, informed members that the site access was deemed acceptable and that there would be low traffic movement from the small-scale development. He discussed the single carriageway and that there was no segregated foot way, which was typical in rural Dorset. Mr Savage highlighted that the site access was safe which would have been suitable for all road users. He provided assurance regarding visibility splays not being severely impacted. There were no objections from highways.

Public Participation

Residents spoke in objection of the planning application as they did not believe it was a desired nor sustainable development for Marnhull. They believed that the development was out of character of the local rural area and were disappointed that there was no provision for affordable housing. Objectors also discussed the site access; they believed it would not be fit for purpose but rather dangerous to those using the road as a means of access to the centre. Residents also discussed their disappointment of the development on the grounds of harm to the landscape, biodiversity loss and flooding. They discussed how woodlands had been destroyed and a result of this was an increase in flooding. They also reminded members that Marnhull did not have enough local amenities to support the development. They believed that the level of harm outweighed the benefits and hoped members would refuse.

Paul Harrington spoke as the agent in support of the application. He informed members that he had worked on many completed schemes and had worked closely with highways and the planning department for the proposed development. Mr Harrington noted the number of objections, however, he believed there would be benefits to the site. He informed members that trees were cut due to the voltage of wiring, but remaining trees and new replacement trees would be protected to ensure an increase in biodiversity. He assured members that adequate space for vehicles had been considered. Mr Harrington also informed

members that homes would be delivered to help contribute to the character of the village.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding the number of road users on Musbury Lane and amenities.
- Consideration of landscaping. Members commented on whether the replacement of trees had been considered to mirror the site before the previous cutting of trees.
- Comments regarding local needs for affordable housing. Members referred to the Development Plan which showed the local need for affordable housing.
- Mitigation of flooding.
- Clarification regarding emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles having sufficient access.
- Members shared their disappointment regarding the removal of trees and the pond.
- Concerns regarding site access.
- Significant loss of biodiversity.
- Clarification regarding whether there had been an increase in flooding due to the removal of trees.
- The site was outside the settlement boundary and members felt it wasn't a substantial development.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **refuse** was proposed by Cllr Carole Jones and seconded by Cllr Val Pothecry.

Decision: To refuse planning permission.

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

155. **P/FUL/2021/04282- Land West And South Of Sandways Farm New Road Bourton Dorset, demolition of barns, form new vehicular and pedestrian access, erection of 30 No. dwellings, construct village hall with parking area and provision of wildlife area, attenuation pond and public open space**

The Case Officer presented to members the demolition of barns, form new vehicular and pedestrian access, erection of 30 No. dwellings, construct village hall with parking area and provision of wildlife area, attenuation pond and public open space.

With the aid of visual representation, members were shown aerial photographs of the site and location. These images also allowed members to view nearby listed buildings. Details regarding the proposed village hall, site layout and designs of the dwellings was also provided. The Case Officer informed members of the scale of the dwellings as well as the lack of affordable housing and highlighted the local need for this in the area. He also discussed the landscaping proposal which wasn't compliant with the development plan and believed that the development was too large for the local area. It impacted heritage and did not believe the benefits outweigh the harm.

Steve Savage, Transport Development Manager, informed members that there were no objections from highways. He discussed how the proposed site access was compliant in terms of visibility and a swept pass analysis had also been approved. The proposed development provided adequate parking.

Public Participation

Frances and Andrew Gillet spoke in objection of the planning objection. They believed that it would change the character of the local area and the nearby listed building. They also discussed how there was not enough local immunities, therefore Bourton was not the appropriate location for these homes which didn't contribute to the local need for affordable housing. They also discussed their concerns regarding the proposed village hall. It would have been used to hold events which would result in more noise. They did not believe that a new village hall was necessary which would have caused a significant amount of harm and create huge costs.

Other residents and the Parish Council spoke in favour of the application. They believed that the current village hall was dated and unsafe. They believed that they needed a social area for residents, like other towns, to prevent residents feeling isolated due to the lack of public transport. Residents believed that the developer had created a modern and sustainable development which would have benefitted the village. Residents and the Parish Council did not believe that there was any other way to raise funds for the construction of a new village hall. They believed it was a low-density scheme which would be detrimental to the character of Bourton. They believed that the site had many benefits and hoped the committee would approve.

Diccon Carpendale spoke in favour of the application as the agent. He hoped members would approve planning permission as the aim of the proposed development was to help Bourton develop. Mr Carpendale informed members that the scheme would have delivered good sized family homes which was appropriate for an aging village. He assured members that the scheme would fit comfortably within the village and believed that the benefits outweigh the harm. Mr Carpendale hoped members would approve planning permission.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification of size of immunity space.
- Confirmation regarding Neighbourhood Plan as a material consideration
- Cllr Ridout believed that the proposal was within a good location and a new village hall would have been beneficial to the area and residents.

- Members commended the thorough officers report.
- Members didn't believe that the proposed development met the aims and objective of Bourton.
- Loss of affordable housing which shouldn't have been negotiable.
- Members noted the neighbourhood plan and importance of supporting them.

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 **refuse** was proposed by Cllr Val Pothecry and seconded by Cllr Stella Jones.

Decision: To refuse planning permission.

156. **P/VOC/2022/06349, Huntley Down Milborne St Andrew DT11 0LN, erect 25 No. dwellings with garages, form vehicular access (with variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2/2018/1240/FUL to amend the approved plans in relation to Plots 19, 20 & 21)**

Erect 25 No. dwellings with garages, form vehicular access (with variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2/2018/1240/FUL to amend the approved plans in relation to Plots 19, 20 & 21).

With the aid of visual representation, members were shown aerial photographs of the site and the approved designs of the dwellings as well as neighbouring properties. He also provided detailed information and images in which the committee had previously agreed too, compared to what had been built by the developer.

Public Participation

Steve Bulley a local resident raised his concerns regarding the site. He informed members that as a resident, he was disappointed with the development as there has been an increase in overlooking and privacy for other properties had not been preserved. Mr Bulley also discussed the increase in noise and how he felt obligations to provide plantation of different tree species had not been met. He described the proposed habited area as a wasteland.

Kevin Maitland-Green another local resident also raised his concerns. He informed members that he was previously one of few that supported the scheme but that was no longer the case. He informed members that there was a lot of chalk and building waste left, which didn't help the appearance on the area in which they live. Mr Maitland-Green also discussed flooding, this had been a result of significant poor drainage which had resulted in an increase in flooding, especially outside one of his properties. He also discussed unofficial areas of play and believed that the developer had flaunted everything that the committee had previously wanted.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding the difference in height of the dwellings and fencing.
- Councillors raised their concerns regarding how the development didn't meet the previous requests of the committee.
- Cllr Ridout believe that the site had been an improvement regarding privacy of neighbouring properties.
- Members also discussed hedging which would minimise noise impact.
- Clarification regarding maintenance of trees and hedging.
- The Northern Area Planning committee was adamant that the landscape plan should be delivered as agreed and requested to be provided with assurance that this would happen.

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 **allow** was proposed by Cllr Carole Jones and seconded by Cllr Belinda Ridout.

Decision: To grant planning permission.

157. **P/LBC/2022/04251, The Little Keep Barrack Road Dorchester Dorset DT1 1SQ, works to the Orderly room only. Remove existing end grain wood block flooring and bitumen base. Lay new DPM and limecrete base supply and lay new end grain wood blocks to match removed blocks.**

Works to the Orderly room only. Remove existing end grain wood block flooring and bitumen base. Lay new DPM and limecrete base supply and lay new end grain wood blocks to match removed blocks.

With the aid of visual representation, members were shown a presentation which showed aerial photographs of the site, the surrounding conservation area as well as a nearby listed building. Members were informed of the current existing unusable floor which was a safety hazard and not good for accessibility. Details regarding the proposed materials were also provided. The significant public benefit was highlighted to members.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- There were questions or comments.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **grant** was proposed by Cllr Les Fry and seconded by Cllr Stella Jones.

Decision: To grant subject to conditions.

158. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

Decision Sheet

159. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 2.00 - 6.07 pm

Chairman

.....