

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 26 SEPTEMBER 2023

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

Apologies: Cllrs Tim Cook, Stella Jones, and Emma Parker

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

Jim Bennett, Ross Cahalane (Lead Project Officer), Enrico Dimarino, Jane Green (Planning Officer), Steven Horsler (Environmental Health Officer), Joshua Kennedy (Apprentice Democratic Services Officer), Hannah Massey (Lawyer - Regulatory), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager, North), Richard Temple (Senior Planning Officer), Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer) and Cass Worman (Planning Officer).

19. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Carole Jones also declared that she was pre-determined for agenda item 10. It was agreed that she would not take part in the discussion or debate.

Cllr Jon Andrews declared that he was pre-determined for agenda item 7. It was agreed that he would not take part in the discussion or debate but would speak as the local ward member.

Cllr Valerie Potheary declared that she acted as chairman for Gillingham Town Council for agenda item 6 when it came before her but made no comments. It was agreed that Cllr Potheary could take part in the debate and vote.

20. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 18th July were confirmed and signed.

21. Registration for 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.

22. Planning Applications

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

23. **P/OUT/2021/02187- Land at E 381150 N 126745, Barnaby Mead to Bay Lane - Footpath, Gillingham**

Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager) gave an update on 5-year Housing Land Supply for the North Dorset Plan Area. She stated that the new housing land supply and housing delivery test for the North Dorset Plan area had recently been published. The new supply is 5.74 years, and the Housing Delivery Test was at 110%.

The latest housing completion data was a material consideration. It demonstrated that housing delivery was back on track. In view of this, the development plan policies relating to housing provision will no longer be automatically “out of date” for the purposes of paragraph 11 of the NPPF, and the tilted balance will not automatically apply. Therefore, full weight can be attributed to the spatial strategy and the housing policies contained within the plan.

It was important to note that there is still a requirement to meet our ongoing housing need. This must be met through development that accords with our spatial strategy or where there are material considerations that may outweigh any conflict with policies contained within the plan.

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. Aerial photographs of the site, access and public rights of way were shown. Members were also provided with details of the neighbouring site plan and the proposed vehicular access. The Case Officer also gave a summary of the section 106 agreement and included photographs of the indicative site plan initially proposed, however, it was highlighted to members that access was for consideration only. He informed members that there were no objectives raised by the highway’s authorities subject to conditions. The recommendation was to grant subject to conditions subject to the section 106 agreement.

Mr S Savage, Transport Development Manager, informed members that traffic movement assessments had been carried out and that tactile paving had been proposed to ensure a safe and suitable access for all road users, giving priority to pedestrians. He discussed vehicle speed being low throughout the development and the well-used public footpath. There were no concerns raised regarding impacts to the highstreets and Mr Savage was satisfied that safety for all road users was assured.

Public Participation

Objections were made from residents who discussed flooding and water retention. Concerns were also raised regarding maintenance, drainage strategies and additional surface water runoff. Mr Kelliher also referred members to chapter 1 of the NPPF. He also discussed the protection of children and did not feel as though the proposal was appropriate for the area. Members were informed that the footpaths were frequently used by students, and they would be victim to dangerous drivers. He hoped members would refuse.

Gillingham Town Council spoke in objection to the proposal. They discussed the loss of existing green space and an increase in traffic congestion, which would cause significant danger risks to pedestrians using the footpaths. Cllr Weeks felt that the area should be protected and therefore members should refuse the officers recommendation.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification on planning considerations.
- Confirmation of flood risk and strategy.
- Maintenance of surface water management.
- Concerns raised regarding pedestrian safety.
- Site access layout.
- Clarification on traffic movements.
- Emergency vehicle access.
- Loss of green space.
- Loss of amenity.
- Members endorsed comments raised by Gillingham Town Council and the Highways authority.

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 Jon Andrews.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for approval.

24. P/FUL/2022/05225- 91 Cheap Street Sherborne Dorset DT9 3LS

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 location were included. In addition to this, members were provided with details of the background of the site as well as details of the flue. The Case Officer discussed the benefits of the vertical section and informed members that it was imperative for filtration. Environmental Health Officer's undertook several visits and were satisfied. The proposal caused less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building and was outweighed by public benefits. The recommendation was to grant.

Mr Dimarino (Engineer, Development Liaison), informed members that he had visited the site and made a full assessment. In summary, there were no negative impacts on highways which were identified. He noted concerns raised by residents regarding illegal parking but reminded members that this would be monitored by traffic wardens at the request of the town council. Mr Dimarino also discussed restricted hours of parking and advised residents of Sherborne to contact the police if illegal parking continued. On balance, there were no reasons for refusal and therefore, supported the officer's recommendation.

Public Participation

The applicant spoke on behalf of her business. She discussed the location of the shop being within a busy town centre and the issues that they had faced. As a small business they took any objections seriously and made necessary changes. It was highlighted to members that deliveries were scheduled only once a week to mitigate disruption. The applicant hoped members would support the officer's recommendation to grant.

Residents spoke in objection to the proposal. Concerns were raised regarding consistent anti-social behaviour, littering and several environmental health issues. They also discussed a lack of parking resulting in customers parking illegally, which they felt factored into the site being in the wrong location. Mr Budden informed members that he had been in communication with the applicant and did not feel as though he was met with a good response. He sympathised with them but still not feel as though the extraction unit was acceptable. Ms Burchell highlighted to members their duty of care to pedestrians and road users and felt as though the problem would be ongoing if granted. Residents felt as though there had been no effort for change. They hoped members would refuse the officer's recommendation.

The Local Ward Member and the Town Council spoke in objection to the proposal. They discussed several concerns made from residents, including road safety issues and numerous incidents of anti-social behaviour during later times at night. Cllr Andrews highlighted the negative impacts of the existing extraction and felt as though the problem would have been ongoing, stating that the takeaway was in an inappropriate location. They informed members that the applicant had not been using the existing extraction fan correctly which has had direct impacts on residents. Cllr Coleridge-Matthews emphasised the number of objections raised and hoped members would consider their decision and reject the proposal.

Members questions and comments

- Concerns regarding impacts on health and safety.
- Clarification of noise reports
- Efficiency impacts of flue
- Clarification on previous means of extraction
- Members questioned as to whether 6 monthly checks could have been ongoing to ensure standards would've been maintained.
- Points of clarification on customer footfall.
- Members were sympathetic to the residents and the applicant.
- Members noted the issues raised by residents, the town council and the local ward member but felt that the extraction equipment had been upgraded.
- Members discussed comments made regarding endangering neighbours mental health and wellbeing.
- Questions regarding opening hours and licensing provisions for the Highstreet location.

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 Belinda Rideout, and seconded by Cllr Mary Penfold.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for approval.

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

25. **P/FUL/2022/03360- Priory Hospital - Former Priory Hospital, Fairfield Bungalows, Blandford Forum, Dorset, DT11 7HX**

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 location, site plan, and proposed elevations and cycle stores were provided. Details including job creation during the construction period, custom to local shops and facilities were included. The officer's presentation also discussed parking and explained to members that 16 spaces and 2 disabled bays was considered acceptable for the 16 units with cycle storage provided.

The main issues, including scale, design, impact on character and appearance, parking, impact on trees and public rights of way were also highlighted to members. The Case Officer informed members that the application was contrary to policies 11 and 14 of the North Dorset Local Plan and that the application was considered to fail to meet policy requirements and was recommended for refusal.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- No affordable housing proposed.

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 Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr Belinda Ridout.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for refusal.

26. **P/FUL/2022/06061- Summerfield Farm, Butts Lane, Stour Provost, Gillingham SP8 5RU**

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. Aerial photographs of the site as well as agricultural images and the proposed dwelling designs were included. Details of the neighbouring residential property and the key planning issues were highlighted. The Case Officer discussed site access and screening. There were no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application. Therefore, the recommendation was to grant, subject to conditions.

Public Participation

Mr Trowbridge explained to members that him and his wife were dairy farmers, not developers, and gave them an insight into their background of dairy farming. He explained that there was a significant shortage of accommodation and emphasised the need for the proposed dwelling. He hoped members would understand the need and would support the officer's recommendation.

Cllr P Patrick spoke on behalf of the Parish Council and the views of residents. She raised concerns regarding the additional dwelling and the future of it. The remote location which was outside the settlement envelope and the dark sky policy was also discussed. Concerns were made regarding visual impacts and the Parish Council did not feel as though the proposal met policy 33 requirements of the North Dorset Local Plan. She also highlighted that long term use of the dwelling could not have been guaranteed and did not feel as though the dwelling was within close proximity to the farm complex. Cllr P Patrick hoped members would carefully consider this application.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification on additional lighting conditions.
- Members noted the agricultural need for the dwelling.

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 Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr David Taylor.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for approval subject to conditions.

27. **P/HOU/2023/01242- River House Stalbridge Lane Sturminster Newton DT10 2JQ**

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 location, access, and existing elevations were shown. Details of the proposed floor plans and alterations were also included. The officer's presentation highlighted the impacts on visual amenity as well as the character on the conservation area and the setting on nearby listed buildings. Members were informed that there was no significant harm to visual or residential amenity, therefore, the recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- There were no 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 **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr Jon Andrews.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for approval.

28. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

29. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 2.00 - 5.15 pm

Chairman

.....