

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 25 OCTOBER 2023

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

Apologies: Cllrs Mike Dyer, David Tooke, and John Worth

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

Elizabeth Adams (Development Management Team Leader), Mike Garrity (Head of Planning), Joshua Kennedy (Apprentice Democratic Services Officer), Hannah Massey (Lawyer - Regulatory) and Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer)

27. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Bill Trite declared that he was pre-determined for agenda items 6 and 7. It was agreed that he would not take part in the discussion or debate but would speak as the local ward member.

Cllr Julie Robinson declared that he was pre-determined for agenda item 9. It was agreed that he would not take part in the discussion or debate but would speak as the local ward member.

28. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 13th September were confirmed and signed.

29. Registration for public speaking and statements

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.

30. Planning Applications

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

31. P/FUL/2022/04653- Pier View Flats, Seymer Road, Swanage, BH19 2AQ

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. Details of the proposed elevations, site location and existing bin storage facilities were included. Members were informed that the site was within the settlement boundary as well as the curtilage of grade 2 listed buildings within the Swanage conservation area and the Dorset AONB. Impacts on the heritage assets and neighbouring amenities were also discussed. The recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Mr Joy thanked members for undertaking site visits. He felt as though the proposal was a health and safety risk to residents and would have detrimental impacts on the listed buildings. He set out his concerns about the location of the proposal and the impacts that the exposed bins would have on neighbouring properties. Mr Joy understood the need but did not feel the proposal was acceptable as all properties would have exposed bins and they would be completely visible. He also raised concerns about privacy as he felt the proposal would be highly damaging and would result in a loss of privacy and amenity for residents of Peter's Hole. In addition to this, the spoke of the wide metal gates which was also considered as an intrusion. Mr Joy felt that there were substantial risks to environmental health and referred to section 16 of the NPPF. He felt further discussions with the applicant were needed and therefore, urged members to refuse.

The Local Ward member, Councillor Trite, also addressed the committee. He asked councils to carefully consider the views of residents. Cllr Trite noted the minor amendments to the proposal but did not feel that there was anything of significance. The Local Ward member felt that the exposed bin store would be an additional nuisance and it would detract from the views of the listed buildings. He considered that there were more suitable areas within the curtilage which wouldn't have such adverse impacts. Cllr Trite emphasised section 16 of the NPPF and urged the committee to refuse.

Members questions and comments

- Questions relating to the size of the bin store not meeting the local need and not being future proof.
- Significant impact on the setting of the listed buildings.
- Members judged that the site visit was very informative and thanked the planning officers but still had concerns regarding the proposal.
- Members did not feel as though the bin store location was suitable and considered it would have visual impacts, causing harm to the conservation area.
- Clarification was sought regarding distance from bin store to properties and environmental health requirements.
- Concerns were raised about impacts from smell, flies, vermin and noise.
- Confirmation of conditions set out in the officer's report.
- Noted issues regarding overlooking.
- Members did not feel as though the bin store conformed with Dorset Council's waste policy requirements.

- Less than substantial harm to heritage assets was not judged to be outweighed by public benefit.

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

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

Refuse for the following reasons:

1. The proposed bin store by reason of its open nature, elevated design and close proximity to the residential dwelling known as Peter's Hole would result in demonstrable harm to neighbouring amenity by reason of overlooking, noise associated with rubbish deposits and collection and odours, contrary to policy D of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
2. The bin store, by reason of its scale, location, open design which will allow views of the bins from the public footpath and associated odours would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of Grade II listed Pier View Flats, Royal Victoria Hotel and Peter's Hole. The harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of accessible bin store provision; the store has insufficient capacity for the identified waste storage needs of the units it is intended to serve. The proposal is contrary to policy LHH of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 and section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

32. **P/LBC/2022/05648- Pier View Flats, Seymer Road, Swanage, BH19 2AQ**

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

Decision: To refuse the officer's recommendation for approval for the following reasons:

1. The bin store, by reason of its scale, location, open design which will allow views of the bins from the public footpath and associated odours would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of Grade II listed Pier View Flats, Royal Victoria Hotel and Peter's Hole. The harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of accessible bin store provision; the store has insufficient capacity for the identified waste storage needs of the units it is intended to serve. The proposal is

contrary to policy LHH of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 and section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

33. **P/HOU/2022/06153- 10 Court Road, Swanage, BH19 1JE**

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, street scenes, rear boundaries and existing views from the property were provided together with existing and proposed floor plans. The Case Officer also explained the assessment of the impacts on neighbouring amenities and overlooking of neighbouring properties. Members were informed that there was not enough harm identified to warrant refusal.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding the number of objections.
- Praised the officer's report and presentation as well as a very informative site visit.
- Members noted that the site was situated in an area where a lot of overlooking already occurred.
- Consideration of fire exit.
- There were more advantages to the resident than there were disadvantages to neighbouring properties.
- No material planning considerations to warrant refusal.
- Confirmation regarding neighbouring properties' previous extensions.
- The Local Ward member felt as though the proposal negatively impacted the character and appearance of the area.

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 Robin Cook, and seconded by Cllr Shane Bartlett.

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

34. **P/FUL/2023/00350- 124 Ringwood Road, Longham, BH22 9AW**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. Details of the history of the site, impacts on nearby listed buildings and neighbouring amenities were discussed as well as noise mitigation through attenuation barriers and waste collection. Illustrations of the existing site and proposed designs were included.

Members were also informed of concerns raised by objectors including those relating to highway safety, but were advised there were no objections from the Highways Team in terms of safety and the proposal complied with parking requirements. The Case officer explained that the application was supported by a noise report which evidenced that conditions could be used to control noise levels of plant. She also explained how conditions had been identified to limit harm to the amenity of residents of the adjoining dementia care home from the proposed use. The Case officer concluded that subject to conditions the proposal was not anticipated to be harmful to the amenity of nearby residents, or visual impacts on the area. The recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Ms Willis spoke on behalf of residents. She considered that the development was intended to serve motorists and did not maintain the character of the area. It didn't enhance the setting or village assets and didn't meet the needs of residents. She explained that residents were concerned about the impacts on historic building and the green belt. Ms Willis highlighted that there are existing eating establishments in the area and residents were concerned that the site would be used by workers in larger vehicles. Objectors did not feel that there was sufficient parking however, they welcomed the operating hours proposed.

The agent spoke in support of the application. He thanked the officer for their thorough report and presentation. Mr Sutton highlighted to members the company pledge and that there had been no objections from statutory consultees. He noted that the site was within the green belt but discussed job creation and contributions to local communities. The agent felt that the site was a sustainable development and hoped members would support the officer's recommendation.

Cllr Hanson Graham spoke on behalf of residents. He informed members that 48 residents had complained about the proposal. He discussed that the site had been empty for a long time and if approved it would negatively impact residents. Cllr Hanson Graham also discussed the highways implications and the proposed operating hours. He also expressed concerns regarding potential for anti-social behaviour.

The local ward member spoke in objection to the application. Cllr Robinson felt as though the proposal wasn't in keeping with the area and highlighted to members that the site location was surrounded by historic buildings and was adjacent to a residential care home. The local ward member also discussed concerns relating to traffic and vehicles parking illegally. She strongly objected to the application.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding public objections in the officer's report and residential properties within proximity to the site.
- Confirmation on location of air conditioning units and delivery access.
- Concerns regarding an increase in traffic and large vehicle usage.
- Insufficient vehicle parking.

- Infrastructure to ensure safety of customers using the site.
- Clarification on additional parking to the rear.
- Confirmation that the acoustic barrier details should be secured to ensure that it would be sufficient to mitigate impacts.
- Clarification regarding current use of the site.
- Concerns raised relating to the impact on the residential care home and residents.
- Tree plantation and landscaping opportunities, especially on the boundary with the care home.
- Clarification that EV charging points were not proposed.
- Endorsed concerns relating to the character of the area and the green belt from residents.
- Amendment to conditions 7 and 9 of the officer's report and amendment to landscaping conditions.
- The need for a condition to prevent vehicular access outside of operating hours.

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 Shane Bartlett, and seconded by Cllr Alex Brenton.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for approval subject to amendments to conditions 5, 7, 9 and an additional condition to secure barriers.

35. **P/FUL/2022/04415- Sturminster Marshall, Golf Club, Moor Lane, Sturminster Marshall, Dorset, BH21 4BD**

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 development were provided. Members were also provided with details of the existing use of the site and the need for the proposal. The Case Officer explained how the application had been assessed in relation to Green Belt policy. . The scale, design and impact on the area were considered acceptable.

Public Participation

Mr Howell's spoke on behalf of the applicant. He informed members that the site was within the Green Belt but the proposed was a single storey building which mitigated visual harm. Mr Howell discussed building materials which were in keeping with the setting of the site. He endorsed the officer's recommendation and hoped members would support.

Members questions and comments

- Confirmation regarding water disposal.
- Members felt that the golf course provided a beneficial facility but noted the risk of urban creep from additional buildings.
- Questions relating to tree planting and screening. An informative note was requested.

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 Robin Cook, and seconded by Cllr Shane Bartlett.

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.

36. **P/FUL/2023/01089- West Moors Middle School, Heathfield Way, West Moors, BH22 0DA**

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. Members were informed that the site was situated within an urban area and would have minimal visual impacts. Details of elevation plans were included, and the Case Officer referred to policy ME1 to highlight the lighting criteria in relation to bats which are a protected species. The recommendation was to grant.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Members fully supported the application and highlighted the need and benefits of the proposal.

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 Shane Bartlett, and seconded by Cllr David Morgan.

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

37. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

38. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 1.15 pm

Chairman

.....