

## **NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 11 APRIL 2023**

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

**Present remotely:** Cllrs

**Apologies:** Cllrs Tim Cook and Emma Parker

**Also present:**

**Also present remotely:**

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

Hannah Smith (Planning Area Manager), Lara Atree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Steve Savage (Transport Development Manager), Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer), Steven Banks (Planning Officer), Jim Bennett and Jane Green

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

160. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Emma Parker and Tim Cook.

161. **Declarations of Interest**

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

162. **Minutes**

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

163. **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.

164. **Planning Applications**

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

165. **P/RES/2022/06180- Common Mead Lane, Gillingham**

The Case Officer gave an update as follows:

- Dorset Council Highway Engineer was satisfied that amended plans had addressed concerns.
- The applicant wanted it made known that 5 units within the scheme would be fully wheelchair accessible. Also, that they were prepared to undertake further tree planting in the northern field.
- Additional condition proposed to remove permitted development rights for the insertion of new first floor windows in the northern gables of Plots 1 and 7, in the interests of adjoining amenity.
- A typo in the report related to the wildlife corridor, which should have read 7m in width, rather than 9m.

With the aid of a visual presentation, The Case Officer showed members aerial photographs and a map of the site. In addition to this, details were also provided regarding site access, changes in design of dwellings, as well as the proposed location and design of affordable housing units. Members were informed that additional planting had been reconsidered by the Applicant and that more plantations would be on site. The Case Officer's presentation also provided artist impressions of the street scene elevations and provided members with further information regarding the SUDS basin and the management of it. Further details about wildlife corridors and distribution of house types across the site were discussed. The officer's recommendation was to grant.

#### **Public Participation**

The agent spoke in favour of the application. Mr Cross informed members that a lot of work had gone into the development and assured them that the development would be completed to a high standard. He discussed the inclusion of affordable housing on the site as well as the benefits of the public open space. Mr Cross had worked with Gillingham Town Council and local primary schools to discuss the educational purposes of biodiversity which would be created from the public open space. He asked officers to accept and approve the officer's recommendation.

Mr Briggs spoke in objection of the development. He believed that it was a sensitive site and residents did not deem it acceptable. He felt that the site didn't meet the character of the area and were concerned about road width for emergency vehicle use. Mr Briggs was pleased about the inclusion of wildlife corridors but did not feel it was good enough. He urged members to refuse the application. However, he made note that if members did grant, residents would hope that further conditions could be added, especially regarding working hours and wildlife corridor maintenance.

#### **Members questions and comments**

- Members asked for points of clarification on tree planting conditions set out in the officer's report.
- Clarification regarding allocated parking for affordable housing and whether the road was sufficient for on street parking and passing of emergency and refuse vehicles.

- Members questioned as to whether there had been any negotiations with Gillingham Town Council regarding allotments on North facing field.
- Condition the inclusion of accessibility in affordable housing for disabled residents. Prior to any development above slab level, a scheme indicating the location of 5 wheelchair accessible dwellings (to include at least one of the affordable units) shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall be implemented before the development is brought into use.
- Members had hoped for more use of renewables and needed points of clarification regarding Low carbon gas boilers.
- Members requested an amendment to Landscaping condition 6. The hard, soft and Masterplan landscaping works detailed on approved drawings must be carried out in full during the first planting season (November to March) following commencement of the development or within a timescale to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The soft landscaping shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed details and any trees or plants which, within a period of 10 years from the completion of the development, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.
- Members felt that the applicant had done a reasonable job and that it was a good use of materials and design. They also believed that the setting on the conservation area had been mitigated the best that it could.
- Members were pleased with the inclusion of bird boxes.
- Boundary treatment of wildlife area.
- Condition for sustainable development and water efficiency. Therefore, the development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a water efficiency calculation in accordance with the Government's National Calculation Methodology for assessing water efficiency in new dwellings has been undertaken which demonstrates that no more than 110 litres of water per person per day shall be consumed within the development, and this calculation has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority; all measures necessary to meet the agreed waste water efficiency.
- Condition to protect amenity and the character of the area. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows or other openings permitted by Class A of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order shall be inserted at first floor level in the northeast elevations of Plots 1 and 7 hereby approved.

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 approve planning permission as recommended, was** proposed by Cllr Jon Andrews, and

seconded by Cllr Carole Jones. Subject to the amended conditions 6 and 7. As well as the added conditions of water efficiency, protection of the character of the area and accessibility for disabled people.

**Decision: To grant subject to conditions.**

166. **P/OUT/2022/04243- Wessex Park Homes Okeford Fitzpaine**

With the aid of a visual presentation, The Case Officer showed members aerial photographs and a map of the site. Members were shown the location of the site and were informed that it was near the AONB but was not within it. The Case Officer showed members an illustration layout plan as well as various photographs of the site, including existing structures and views from the eastern and southwestern boundary. The recommendation was to grant subject to conditions outlined in the officer's report and the completion of section 106 agreement.

**Public Participation**

The agent addressed the committee and informed members that the site was redundant, and no other interest had been expressed. Mr Bennett discussed the local need for housing and believed that the scheme was well designed and would meet the housing needs. He did not feel as though the site would diminish Okeford Fitzpaine or Shillingstone, but integrated buildings would enhance the character of the area. Mr Bennett discussed the scale of the existing site as well as footpath links to the neighbouring villages. He also believed that there would be a reduction on vehicle movements. The agent commended the officers report asked members to support.

**Members questions and comments**

- Clarification regarding prior approval of building conversions from industrial use to residential units.
- Clarification regarding local boundaries and if neighbourhood plans comply.
- Members were pleased to see the use of a redundant brown field site and welcomed the inclusion of 40% affordable housing in an already established village.
- Concerns regarding contaminated land and residents becoming isolated.
- Clarification regarding footpath links from the site to the centre of Okeford Fitzpaine.
- Mitigation for wastewater.
- Members noted that the site was outside the village settlement boundary and would create a loss of industrial land.
- Clarification regarding housing teams supporting the scheme.

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 approve planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Ridout, and seconded by Cllr Jones subject to conditions.**

**Decision: To grant subject to conditions**

167. **P/FUL/2022/05382- Unit 48 Enterprise Park, Piddlehinton**

With the aid of a visual presentation, The Case Officer showed members aerial photographs and a map of the site. Details regarding the site being near the AONB but not within it as well as Rights of Way were also discussed. The presentation also included photographs of the existing building, site, and proposed floor plans for the extension. The recommendation was to grant.

**Public Participation**

Mr Summers spoke in favour of the proposal. He informed members that the proposed extension would allow for further employment and would make the workplace more efficient for a local business. He informed members that a lot of consideration had gone into the extension plans to ensure they would fit in with other dwellings. The applicant also discussed the installation of solar panels if granted as well as controlled deliveries and collections to support the local villages requests. Mr Summers assured members that the site would only be used during normal working hours and no chemicals were on site. He hoped members would support the officer's recommendation.

Mr Ebdon spoke on behalf of the Parish Council. He informed members that the Enterprise Park was the main employment for Piddle Valley and the Parish Council supported the economic benefits. However, Mr Ebdon could not support the application as he believed it was contrary to policy 10 of the neighbourhood plan and the proposed scale of the extension would be detrimental to the visual immunity and therefore would impact the character of the area. Concerns were also raised regarding an increase in traffic, particularly larger vehicles. Mr Ebdon believed that the site would be better suited for smaller businesses. He hoped members would refuse this application.

**Members questions and comments**

- Clarification regarding job creation on the site as well as whether the proposed extension would be the tallest building on site.
- Condition to mitigate light pollution. Prior to the commencement of any development above foundation level, details of a lighting scheme shall have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the lighting scheme shall be installed, operated, and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme and there shall be no further lighting of the development, other than in accordance with the approved scheme.
- Condition per minable surfaces to reduce water runoff. Drainage condition for surface water. Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, details of the surface water drainage work shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved drainage scheme shall have been completed before the occupation of the development.
- Members were pleased to support a growing business.

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 approve planning permission as recommended, was** proposed by Cllr Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr Carole Jones, subject to the added conditions of lighting and drainage.

**Decision: To grant subject to conditions.**

168. **P/FUL/2022/07272- 3 Stevens Close, Blandford Forum**

With the aid of a visual presentation, The Case Officer showed members aerial photographs and a map of the site. Details regarding the site being near the AONB but not within it as well as Rights of Way were also discussed. The presentation also included photographs of the existing building, site, and proposed floor plans for the extension. The recommendation was to grant.

**Public Participation**

Mr Summers spoke in favour of the proposal. He informed members that the proposed extension would allow for further employment and would make the workplace more efficient for a local business. He informed members that a lot of consideration had gone into the extension plans to ensure they would fit in with other dwellings. The applicant also discussed the installation of solar panels if granted as well as controlled deliveries and collections to support the local villages requests. Mr Summers assured members that the site would only be used during normal working hours and no chemicals were on site. He hoped members would support the officer's recommendation.

Mr Ebdon spoke on behalf of the Parish Council. He informed members that the Enterprise Park was the main employment for Piddle Valley and the Parish Council supported the economic benefits. However, Mr Ebdon could not support the application as he believed it was contrary to policy 10 of the neighbourhood plan and the proposed scale of the extension would be detrimental to the visual immunity and therefore would impact the character of the area. Concerns were also raised regarding an increase in traffic, particularly larger vehicles. Mr Ebdon believed that the site would be better suited for smaller businesses. He hoped members would refuse this application.

**Members questions and comments**

- Clarification regarding job creation on the site as well as whether the proposed extension would be the tallest building on site.
- Condition to mitigate light pollution. Prior to the commencement of any development above foundation level, details of a lighting scheme shall have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the lighting scheme shall be installed, operated, and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme and there shall be no further lighting of the development, other than in accordance with the approved scheme.
- Condition per minable surfaces to reduce water runoff. Drainage condition for surface water. Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, details of the surface water drainage work shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and

the approved drainage scheme shall have been completed before the occupation of the development.

- Members were pleased to support a growing business.

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 approve planning permission as recommended, was** proposed by Cllr Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr Carole Jones, subject to the added conditions of lighting and drainage.

**Decision: To grant subject to conditions.**

169. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

170. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business

**Update Sheet**

**Duration of meeting:** 2.00 - 4.12 pm

**Chairman**

.....