

## **NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 16 MAY 2023**

**Present:** Cllrs Sherry Jespersen (Chairman), Mary Penfold (Vice-Chairman), Tim Cook, Brian Heatley, Carole Jones, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout and David Taylor

**Present remotely:** Cllrs

**Apologies:** Cllrs Jon Andrews, Les Fry, Stella Jones, and Emma Parker

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

Jim Bennett, Joshua Kennedy (Apprentice Democratic Services Officer), Hannah Massey (Lawyer - Regulatory), Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer), Steve Savage (Transport Development Manager), Simon Sharp (Senior Planning Officer), Hannah Smith (Planning Area Manager) and Cass Worman (Planning Officer)

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

1. **Declarations of Interest**

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

2. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> April were confirmed and signed.

3. **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.

4. **Planning Applications**

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

5. **P/VOC/2022/05646- Frogmore Lane, Sixpenny Handley**

It was requested that the Land at Leigh Road Colehill Wimborne application P/VOC/2022/05646 be deferred as officers needed to obtain further information. The deferral would allow time for officers to correlate all information prior to consideration by the committee.

## 6. **P/FUL/2022/06898- Enterprise Park, Piddlehinton**

With the aid of a visual presentation, the Case Officer explained the planning application to member. Details including photographs of site access, proposed elevation designs, layout, site location and surrounding boundaries was discussed. The Case Officer explained the use of the current existing units. He showed members different viewpoints of the site and explained the areas of concern. Members were informed that officers didn't believe it would create significant visual harm. The recommendation was to grant subject to conditions.

### **Public Participation**

The agent spoke in support of the application. He discussed the demand for the site and the specific need for employment which had been highlighted in the Local Plan. Mr Parke reiterated to members that the proposed development was not of a huge scale and size, he explained that this was to mitigate risks on visual harm. Members were also informed that the site would have been used to accommodate small businesses. The agent also discussed highways assessments and believed that the benefits outweigh the harm. He hoped members would support the officer's recommendation.

The Parish Council spoke in objection to the planning application. They believed it would have a negative impact on the unique military camp and felt the new building was inadequate. Mr Ebdon raised his concerns regarding the photographs used in the presentation, which he did not feel were up to date. He also discussed the number of proposed parking spaces, which the Parish Council felt would generate more traffic movement. Mr Ebdon discussed the need for supporting economic developments, however, he felt that the scale of the buildings was too large and was contrary to the local plan.

### **Members questions and comments**

- Clarification regarding sustainability of all units.
- Confirmation on the scale of the new building compared to the existing visible building above the tree line.
- Members referred to historic character and requested clarification regarding materials used.
- Clarification regarding Neighbourhood Plan approval.
- Clarification regarding whether the sites or existing huts had any designation.
- Questions regarding pollution and drainage considerations.
- Members noted that it was an employment site and the applicant had responded well to the established need for the units. They felt that it was small and sustainable with good landscaping.
- Neighbourhood Plan stated that the site was a designated employment site.
- Understands the points raised by the Parish Council.
- Clarification regarding how conclusion of small-scale units was made.
- Members commented on the scale of the proposed units and believed it was considerable smaller when compared to other commercial units.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to approve the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Tim Cook and seconded by Cllr Carole Jones subject to revised conditions.

**Decision:** To approve the officer's recommendation to grant.

7. **P/FUL/2022/07038- Old Post Office House Church Road Bradford Abbas Dorset DT9 6RF**

With the aid of a visual presentation, the Case Officer explained the planning application to members. Details including photographs of proposed designs and the site location was discussed. Members were given a summary of the historic performance of the site and the Local Policy Plan was highlighted. The Case Officer informed members that the site was not financially or commercially viable and that the new owners had made a conscious effort to look at viability. The Officer's recommendation was to approve.

**Public Participation**

Members of the public and Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. They felt that there was a strong local need for the village shop and felt that the application was contrary to the NPPF. Objectors discussed the marketing of the post office and felt that the business continuity had not been encouraged. In addition to this, objectors believed that there had been numerous situations in which the village shop would have been viable, especially due to the lack of bus services in the area. They felt the shop would support the need of all residents, particularly elder residents. Local residents were not satisfied and did not see any reason as to why they shouldn't have had a village shop.

The applicant spoke in support of the officer's report. Members were informed that prior to purchasing their home, it had been marketed for 4 years. Members were informed that the retail space was not visibly separate from the living area. Mr Roach highlighted the need for local resources but felt that needs were being met in other ways, including the local market. He hoped members would accept and support the officer's recommendation.

**Members questions and comments**

- Clarification regarding details of the means of marketing that were used.
- Clarification around the responsibility and weight of the marketing which was carried out several years ago.
- Members felt the viability test was out of date.
- Questions regarding the original use and purpose of the building.
- Requested for the Case Officer to elaborate on the 1839 heritage significance.

- Accepts the request of the current owner but considered the views of the objectors.
- Not financially viable and hasn't been for a very long time.
- Members felt that the village did have a need, however, members felt the residents had used their resources for other solutions.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to approve the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Carole Jones, and seconded by Cllr Belinda Ridout.

**Decision:** To approve the officer's recommendation to grant.

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

#### 8. **P/FUL/2022/07513- Frog Lane Farm, Motcombe**

With the aid of a visual presentation, the Case Officer explained the planning application to members. Details including aerial photographs of the site, site location and surrounding settlement boundaries was discussed. In addition to this, members were shown photographs of proposed designs and were provided with details of the existing use of the building. Photographs of street scenes, junctions, and relationship from the proposed site to public rights of way were also included. The Case Officer informed members of the assessments carried out by environmental health colleagues and discussed visual harm. The Officer's recommendation was to grant.

Steve Savage, Transport Development Manager, discussed the unclassified road which had no footways or lighting, which was well used by pedestrians. Mr Savage informed members that the applicant had provided sufficient information. He also discussed traffic generation and informed members that in terms of the NPPF, traffic movements would have been reduced due to the development.

#### **Public Participation**

The agent spoke in favour of the application. Ms Gatehouse discussed minimal traffic movements and the noise impact assessment. She also referred to several policies which supported the proposed development, including policies 11,20 and 29. The agent informed members that the applicant had worked hard to overcome concerns made by residents and had made good economic use of the existing building. She hoped members would support the officer's recommendation to grant.

Cllr Taylor spoke on behalf the Parish Council. Motcombe objected in terms of traffic safety, damage, and several other factors. He discussed unsuitability and

damage to insufficient roads. In addition to this, he also highlighted to members the lack of visibility from the school which was concerning. Cllr Taylor also raised his concerns regarding noise pollution. He also discussed environmental reasons for refusal, in particular, materials not being locally sourced. He urged the committee to reject the application.

### **Members questions and comments**

- Clarification regarding cause of damage to verges and noise assessments.
- Members praised the officer's detailed report and presentation.
- Stone pollution and how it will be disposed and controlled.
- Monitoring of hours of work
- It was noted that the site was near but not within the AONB.
- Clarification on the enforcement of the route.
- Location of the footpath through the site and the potential to relocate.
- Mitigation to reduce noise disturbance.
- Members commented on the importance of the Neighbourhood Plan but also noted the importance supporting local businesses.
- Not a purpose-built building for stone cutting.
- Members felt further information was needed from officers to make a decision.

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

**Decision:** To defer the item to allow for further information regarding conditions to limit noise from the development, and the resultant impact on the amenity of the countryside, in this location.

### **9. P/2022/00536- Land at Lower Blandford Road, Shaftesbury Dorset**

With the aid of a visual presentation, the Case Officer explained the planning application to members. Details including photographs of site access, proposed designs, site location and surrounding settlement boundaries was discussed. The Case Officer discussed visibility splays and provided information regarding the belt of trees adjacent to the site. Members were informed that the applicant had responded significantly to officer concerns and had reduced the number of dwellings. The Case Officer discussed the Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan and the protection of trees. The presentation also included details of the public right of way. The officer's recommendation was to grant.

Steve Savage, Transport Development Manager, informed members that the site was considered acceptable in terms of layout and design. Members were informed that the crossing would be subject to agreement and gave details regarding speed surveys carried out in 2019 which showed the site to be a low traffic generator.

The Transport Development Manager also discussed no segregated footways on Blandford Road. Highways supported the proposed application.

### **Public Participation**

The agent spoke in favour of the application. He discussed the location of the site being entirely on the settlement boundary of Shaftesbury. He informed members that the applicant had responded to previous concerns and had reduced the original number of dwellings proposed. Mr Foster felt that the development supported the local need and felt the harm didn't outweigh the benefits.

Ms Hunt spoke in objection to the application. She felt that the proposal had a negative impact on the entrance to Shaftesbury and created severally high traffic movements. Ms Hunt informed members that the approval of the site would join town and countryside together. She also discussed the elevation of the site being intrusive to neighbours. In addition to this, wildlife corridor damage and environmental losses.

Both Town Councils and the Local Ward Member objected to the proposed development. They felt as though it would cause a significant amount of harm to the buffer between the town and villages. Destruction to good established trees, wildlife and impacts on biodiversity was also discussed. Members were informed that the elevation of the site would impact visual harm and would result in a loss of privacy. They felt as though Shaftesbury did not need any further developments and did not believe that the site entrance was acceptable, due to being near a busy roundabout. The Ward Member also highlighted concerns regarding refuse vehicles not being able to safely access the site. They also requested for further surveys to be carried out as they did not feel the current ones reflected the real traffic movements of the site. Cllr Somper felt as though the increased traffic and pedestrian crossings would create danger for residents when crossing an even busier road. They hoped members would reject the proposal.

### **Members questions and comments**

- Confirmation on an uncontrolled crossing
- Clarification on the use of the public rights of way
- IOWA Policy clarification and the weight that they attach.
- Members also questioned the housing supply delivery.
- Shaftesbury has had a lot of developments already.
- Members felt that the site was sensitive and important.
- Adverse impacts on the area.
- Doesn't contribute to affordable housing.
- Members felt the site was an important buffer zone between town and village.

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 the officer's recommendation to approve planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Tim Cook and seconded by Cllr Belinda Ridout.

**Decision:** To overturn the officer's recommendation to approve and refuse planning permission as the proposal would encroach on the green area between Shaftesbury and Cann and cause adverse visual harm to the character of the Important Treed Area, specifically the setting of the protected trees and the experience from the public rights of way network, which would be contrary to Policy SFGI1 of the Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan and policy 4 of the North Dorset Local Plan, First Revision. These adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits derived from the development.

10. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

11. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

**Decision Sheet**

**Duration of meeting:** 12.00 - 4.40 pm

**Chairman**

.....