

## **EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 5 JULY 2023**

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

**Apologies:** Cllrs Mike Barron and John Worth

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

Elizabeth Adams (Development Management Team Leader), Lara Aintree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Owen Clark (Strategic and Policy Team Manager), Ed Denham (School Admissions Manager), Ursula Fay, Hilary Jordan (Service Manager for Spatial Planning), Joshua Kennedy (Apprentice Democratic Services Officer), Anna Lee (Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement), Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer), Steve Savage (Transport Development Manager), Naomi Shinkins (Planning Officer), Elaine Tibble (Senior Democratic Services Officer) and Alister Trendell (Project Engineer).

**369. Declarations of Interest**

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

**370. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May were confirmed and signed.

**371. Public Speaking**

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.

**372. Planning Applications**

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

**373. P/OUT/2023/01166- Land to the south of Ringwood Road Alderholt**

The Case Officer gave members an update:

- 3G Sports pitch contribution- material however proportionate contribution would be in the range £101,673- £142,342 (applicant has offered £1million).
- Tennis contribution- can be considered material only as part of recreation ground extension.
- Public Art Contribution- not material.
- Change to recommended reason for refusal 4
- Updated Hampshire County Council Response
- Updated Dorset Wildlife Trust Response
- Updated Fordingbridge Town Council response
- Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council response
- Additional public responses

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. Photographs of the site plan, existing nearby settlement boundaries and existing agricultural buildings were included. Members were also shown special protection areas near the site. Details including proposed site access, illustrative masterplans, housing mix, existing nearby facilities, including doctor surgeries and local schools, and proposed employment uses were also provided. The Case Officer also informed members of the proposed phasing plans. In addition to this, concerns from National Highways were raised, members were informed that more data was needed, particularly clarity of bus services, long term viability and costing.

The presentation also included details of the proposed education provision which hadn't been accepted by Dorset Education. In addition to this, the Landscape strategy and integration of hedgerows were also outlined. The Case Officer also highlighted key concerns regarding site sustainability. Members were informed regarding the impacts on Habitats sites, and it was explained that an Appropriate Assessment had not been able to conclude that impacts on these could be adequately mitigated.

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment was explained, and members were informed that there were no visual impacts on the AONB. Other impacts arising on the AONB were explained. Photographs from southwestern and the southern end of Ringwood Road and predicted photographs of the site in several years' time were also shown to members of the committee. Details regarding the drainage strategy and planning obligations were also provided. The officer's recommendation was to refuse for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

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

### **Public Participation**

Residents and the Parish Council's spoke in objection to the application. They felt as though the development was unsustainable and didn't feel as though it was in the right location, especially for the scale of the development. Concerns were raised regarding the large site bounded to have delays which would have further costing impacts. Mr S Godsell also discussed the reduction in affordable housing

and felt the applicants promise of a village centre was only dependant on retailers wanting to invest and buy plots in such a rural location. Another area of discussion from objectors was the impacts on highways. Mr C English informed members that if they chose to approve, there would be additional traffic which would cause chaos. He felt as though the impact on all roads had been underestimated and there would be detrimental harm to verges and banks.

Mr R Burden spoke for Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership. He felt that a development near the AONB setting should have been sensitively considered and that there had been no realistic proposals to avoid or mitigate the impacts. Objectors also raised their concerns around residents needing to own cars to get to and from Alderholt. This then impacts the environment and adds to their concerns around traffic. An hourly bus service would not be a good alternative; therefore, they didn't feel as though it could have possibly been considered as a sustainable development. Mr M Allen felt as though the development would be a small town on a green field site and didn't feel there was a local need.

Objectors also discussed their disappointment in the applicant for proposing a development that had not considered the needs of Alderholt, Mr S Butler informed members that Alderholt's need for social housing was low and felt as though they would be creating competition between the existing and proposed village centre. He also mentioned the impacts on education and felt that the school would be oversubscribed. Objectors informed members that they did not want this application and felt that the significant minor benefits were not outbalanced by the risks and hoped members would support the officer's recommendation to refuse.

Ms J Pickering spoke on behalf of the NHS and was not in support or objection to the application. She highlighted to members the pressures that NHS staff were currently under and discussed the health care services that were currently available to residents of Alderholt. Ms J Pickering informed members that the current Alderholt surgery was small and required a lot of renovations to make it more suitable for residents. In her presentation, she concluded how many additional NHS patients would be a result of the proposed development, she informed members that if the development was approved, additional work would need to take place and funding would need to be considered.

Both the applicant and agent spoke in support of the development. They believed that the site would deliver much needed homes with a mixture of housing types without impacting the green belt. Mr N Jacobs felt that Alderholt was capable of strategic growth and the development would help to enhance the sustainability of an area in Dorset as well as providing residents with a wide range of facilities. The Agent referenced the out-of-date local plan and highlighted to members that the applicant would ask to defer the application and work with officers to overcome any issues and make the necessary amendments.

The applicant, Mr M Hewett discussed the benefits of the development, in particularly, the creation of a thriving community and additional doctor's surgery and school. He informed members that he had responded to the concerns raised by local schools. He highlighted the investment into education which would solve any issues previously raised by schools. Mr M Hewett also discussed the proposed introduction of an hourly bus service, allocated open space and 13km of

cycle ways to promote recreation. He felt as though the benefits to the community were significant and hoped members would grant a short extension to allow for more cooperation between himself and officers.

Cllr Errington spoke on behalf of Ellingham, Harbridge, and Ibsley Parish Council. It was reiterated to members that the proposed site was situated within a rural location and was far too excessive in scale and was not within a sustainable location. In addition to this, concerns were also raised regarding traffic and felt as though the completion of the proposed development would leave Alderholt in confusion as to whether it was a village or town. Cllr Errington hoped members would refuse the proposed development.

Cllr Logan spoke on behalf of Alderholt Parish Council. She fully conferred with the officer's recommendation to refuse as well as the concerns raised by the residents and other Parish Council. The Parish Council felt as though the site was within an unsustainable location and believed it was contrary to the NPPF. Cllr Logan confirmed that she had read the comprehensive report and believed that the proposed development should be refused for all reasons set out in the officer's report. In her presentation, Cllr Logan discussed the lack of connectivity and felt as though the proposed village centre would cause direct competition with Alderholt's existing facilities. She also felt as though the local road infrastructure was inadequate and the long-term adverse impacts would be detrimental. The Parish Council felt as though the impacts outweigh the benefits, therefore, they supported the officer's recommendation for refusal.

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

- Praised the officer's report and presentation.
- Roads are narrow and are not suitable.
- Added facilities would solve some issues but would not outweigh the significant drawbacks.
- Issues relating to transport and highways.
- Clarification around mineral extraction prior to construction.
- Maintenance of mature hedges.
- Alderholt remains very isolated.
- Inadequate road infrastructure.
- Concerns regarding surface water drainage.
- Questions regarding Alderholt being developed into a town.
- Clarification of the impacts that the proposal would have on education.

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 refuse planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Shane Bartlett, and seconded by Cllr Robin Cook.

**Decision:** To support the officer's recommendation for refusal, subject to the amended reason for refusal for affordable housing and viability.

374. **3/19/2077/RM- Land North of Ringwood Road, Alderholt, SP6 3HZ**

The Case Officer gave members an update:

- The Section 33 legal agreement facilitating Bickton Fish Farm credits to be used in the Dorset Council Area is now complete (dated 3 July '23)
- The applicant has included a clause within the Deed of Variation for this application to secure phosphate credits from Bickton Fish Farm as required by the recommendation.
- A compliance condition for landscape management will be added to the list of conditions:
  - The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Landscape Ecological Management Plan DD350.R01 REV D dated 31.03.23.  
Reason: To protect the landscape character of the area and to mitigate, compensate and enhance/provide net gain for impacts on biodiversity
- Informative regarding construction hours and bonfires to be added:
  - The Construction Management Plan required by Condition 9 of PA 3/16/1446/OUT shall include the following details:
    - Hours of construction - 08:00 and 18:00 weekdays, 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays and no work on Sundays or Public Holidays
    - No bonfires on site at any time
- Clarifications in the officer report include:
  - 5.1: The site does not just comprise 'open land'. It includes Hawthorns (a dwelling) and various horticultural/ agricultural buildings.
  - 15.4.10: reference to the design code is incorrect.
  - 15.5.4, 15.5.8, 15.5.9, 15.5.13: to clarify, separate landscaping conditions are not required, approved landscape plans are listed in condition 1 and the landscape management plan condition has been added.
  - 15.7.2 – refers to a net increase of 44 dwellings – 45 dwellings are proposed but 1 dwelling replaces the existing dwelling associated with the nursery on site.

With the aid of a visual presentation including illustrative plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. Members were informed of the history of the site and a table of proposed residential development was presented. Photographs including designs of the elevations and views of the site were included, in addition to this the Case Officer also discussed the inclusion of affordable housing and informed members of the reasons as to why there had been a reduction, which was approved at committee in February 2023.. House types and mix were also a point of discussion, members were informed that there would be a mixture of 1–4-bedroom dwellings.

The Case Officer outlined the refuse storage and collection as well as the proposed site access and drainage strategy. Members were informed that there would be 116 parking spaces, including 14 visitor spaces and additional cycle

stores. Details regarding landscaping, boundaries and protection of existing trees and hedging were discussed. The Officer's presentation also highlighted the proposed public open space across the site and informed members that the LEAP space was considered acceptable. Details of the nutrient neutrality assessment and SANG were also discussed. The officer's recommendation was to approve.

### **Public Participation**

Mr C Walker spoke in objection of the application. He raised several concerns regarding phosphate mitigation and compared it to noise, smell, and chemical pollution. He did not feel as though the site was acceptable and hoped members would refuse the application.

The agent spoke in support of the application and praised the officer's report and comprehensive presentation. Mr R Lofthouse discussed the nutrient neutrality assessment as well as the agreed SANG. He also spoke of the housing mix which would be included across the site which he felt made a significant contribution to the local housing need. The agent praised the design as it was appropriate to the character and appearance of the area. Mr R Lofthouse assured members that they were committed to the site and completing the development.

The Parish Council addressed the committee and informed members that they had read the officer's report thoroughly. Cllr G Logan requested to review a slide from the officer's presentation and raised concerns regarding the footpath, therefore, she hoped officer's and members would agree for this not to be built on this site. Cllr G Logan also discussed the existing hedgerow as she was under the impression that it would be retained and enhanced. The Parish Council hoped that the boundary would be enhanced. Officers agreed an amended plan would be submitted to remove the footpath in question.

### **Members questions and comments**

- Security of the site boundary raised concerns.
- Relocation of fish from Bickton fish farm.
- Pleased that the roads can be adopted.
- Clarification around the reduction of affordable housing.
- Clarification around communal drying areas in the apartment block.
- Concerns around additional on street parking and whether the width of roads would be sufficient.
- Questions regarding management of the attenuation pond.
- Clarification around cycle and pedestrian site access
- Members were pleased to see a mixture of housing types, particularly the inclusion of bungalows.

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** the officer's recommendation to approve planning permission as recommended with the addition of the amended plans to remove the footpath requested by the Parish Council, was proposed by Cllr Robin Cook, and seconded by Cllr Alex Brenton.

**Decision:** To grant the officer's recommendation subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report, additional condition and informative presented and the amended plans to exclude the footpath (delegated to officers).

375. **P/FUL/2022/07181- Purbeck Mineral and Mining Museum Norden BH20  
5DW**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. Photographs of the proposed site, elevation designs and existing structures were also included. Members were informed that the site was within the AONB but there was limited impact due to screening. The Case Officer also discussed surface water flooding and the existing use of the site. No harm was identified; therefore, the officer's recommendation was to approve.

**Public Participation**

There was no public participation.

**Members questions and comments**

- Members praised the concise officer's report and presentation.
- Clarification of the roof line.
- Members felt that the proposal would be an excellent facility.

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** the officer's recommendation to approve planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Shane Bartlett, and seconded by Cllr Alex Brenton.

**Decision:** To grant the officer's recommendation subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

376. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

377. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

**Decision Sheet**

**Duration of meeting:** 10.00 am - 2.58 pm

**Chairman**

