

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 31 JULY 2024

Present: Cllrs David Tooke (Chair), Duncan Sowry-House (Vice-Chair), Alex Brenton, Toni Coombs, Beryl Ezzard, Scott Florek, Spencer Flower, David Morgan, Andy Skeats and Bill Tritte

Apologies: Cllrs Barry Goringe and Hannah Hobbs-Chell

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

Elizabeth Adams (Development Management Team Leader), Lara Aintree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), James Brightman (Senior Planning Officer), Kim Cowell (Development Management Area Manager (East)), Claire Hicks, Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), Ellie Lee, Emma MacDonald (Planning Officer) and Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer)

85. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Beryl Ezzard made a declaration in respect of agenda item 11 that she would not take part in the debate or vote but would speak as the Local Ward Member and would withdraw herself from the meeting once she had made her representation.

Cllr Scott Florek, made a declaration to agenda item 10, it was agreed that he would not take part in the debate or vote, nor would he speak as the Local Member. He agreed to withdraw himself from the meeting.

Cllr Duncan Sowry-House made a declaration to agenda item 10, it was agreed that he would not take part in the debate or vote but would speak as the Local Ward Member and would withdraw himself from the meeting once he had made his representation.

86. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 24th April were confirmed.

87. 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.

88. **Planning Applications**

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

89. **P/RES/2024/01209 - 97 and 99 High Street, Sturminster Marshall, BH21 4AT**

Update:

- There was an additional plan Drawing No. DD06B Proposed floor & roof plans houses 3-5 that had not been published within the officer's report.

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 street scenes highlighted the existing buildings and details of the refused dwellings were discussed. Images of the proposed elevations, roof plans and an artist impression of the proposal were also included within the presentation. Details of the proposed landscaping as well as the impact on the character and appearance of the area and setting of the listed Holly Cottage were outlined. As well as highlighting the impact on the living conditions of occupants adjacent to the proposal, members were informed of the site history, that the principle of development had been approved in outline and that there was no harm to the adjacent heritage assets. There was no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the immediate area and the scale of the dwelling was now deemed acceptable having been reduced following the refusal of a previous application.

In addition to this the Case Officer also provided members with submitted images of the proposed elevations, floor and roof plans. The officer's recommendation was to grant planning permission for both applications subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

The planning agent addressed the committee and introduced himself as a representative on behalf of the applicant. Mr McKeon explained the history of the proposal which had previously been refused due the impact on the nearby listed building. The proposal had been revised and the proposed street scenes had reduced in scale. He highlighted that there had been an increase in spacing between the properties, there was no harm to the heritage asset and the units had reduced in scale. The strategic positioning of the bedroom window would have not created harm or overlooking. The agent extended their thanks to the officers and expressed their opinion that the best possible scheme had been presented to members. To conclude, Mr McKeon suggested that the proposal built upon positive aspects of the previous application and in principle, it was an attractive and good scheme which included good parking provision which contributed to the character and appearance of the High Street.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding the history of the development.
- Clarification regarding the scale of the development and the proposed floor space.
- Biodiversity mitigation
- Noise attenuation and boundaries to protect the amenity of neighbours.
- Confirmation of the landscaping scheme.
- Members noted the objections raised from the Parish Council and their comments regarding the scale of the development not being in keeping with the area.
- Consideration of solar panels.
- Reduction in the height of the proposal.
- Clarification regarding the proposed road surfacing materials for noise mitigation.
- Referred to the need for an additional condition to remove permitted development rights for extensions above ground floor level for the proposed dwellings.

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 Spencer Flower, and seconded by Cllr Andy Skeats, subject to the additional condition of permitted development rights above ground floor level as well as conditions set out in the officer's report.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for approval subject to the additional condition to remove permitted development rights for extensions above ground floor level as well as the conditions set out in the officer's report.

90. **P/FUL/2024/00495 - 1 Cherry Tree Close, St Leonards and St Ives, BH24 2QN**

Update:

- There was a typo in the report regarding space standards.

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. Drawings of the proposed floor plans, elevations and block plan were shown. Images of the existing and proposed development and street scenes were also included. The principle of development in this location was explained along with examples of 'backland' development in the vicinity, the impact upon neighbouring amenity, amenity of future occupiers, trees and landscaping. In addition to this, details regarding highways, parking, flooding, drainage and impacts to Dorset heathlands were also set out. The principle of development was considered to be acceptable and accorded with local policy KS2. Therefore, the officer's recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Cllr Parker spoke on behalf of the Parish Council in objection to the proposal. He referenced the site as being in a rural area, and considered the proposal to be overdevelopment which did not preserve the character of the area. In addition to this, the Parish Council considered the proposal to breach policies HE2 and HE3 of the Christchurch and Ease Dorset Local Plan as well as policies the East Dorset Local Plan. The speaker advised that parking was inadequate, there were no visitor spaces and parking would worsen on an already narrow road. He referenced 'backland' development at 9 Cherry Tree close and expressed concern over development elsewhere in St Leonards but stressed that members needed to consider each application on its own merits. Concerns were also raised about surface water flooding, and he hoped members would refuse the officers recommendation.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding fire building regulations and emergency vehicle access.
- Confirmation on imposing conditions regarding pumping systems.
- Questions regarding whether there had been evidence as to whether surface water flooding had worsened.
- Clarification as to whether there was a site management plan and rational for continuation of construction.
- Concerns regarding local impact and surface water flooding.
- Members were sympathetic to the concerns raised by the Parish Council.
- Members noted that there were engineering solutions to mitigate flooding risk.
- Concerns regarding parking provision.
- Amendment to condition 6 identified as necessary to amend the hours of construction in the interests of neighbouring amenity.

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 Toni Coombs, and seconded by Cllr Duncan Sowry-House with the additional condition of a site management plan to include contractors arrangements for parking as well as an amendment to condition 6 regarding an alteration to the hours of construction, with a restriction to 6pm instead of 7pm as proposed in the officer recommendation.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for approval subject to conditions set out in the officer's report, an additional condition to secure a site management plan and an amendment to condition 6 regarding an alteration to the hours of construction.

91. **P/FUL/2023/03855 - Kemps Country House, Wareham Road, East Stoke**

Update:

- The Case Officer provided an update regarding Nutrient Neutrality. The Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour Supplementary Planning Document could no longer be given weight and alternative mitigation to avoid harm to Poole Harbour Special Protection Area would be required prior to a positive determination of the planning application.

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 existing site and proposed plans were shown. Members were provided with details of the housing delivery test and the previously refused scheme. The Case Officer also referred to the planning designations and constraints, in particular noting surface water flood risk, the National Landscape (AONB), Tree Preservation Order and groundwater flood risk susceptibility. The scale, layout, design and impact on character and appearance of area were considered to be acceptable subject to conditions. Therefore, the officer's recommendation was that Members grant delegated power to the Head of Planning to grant permission subject to conditions set out in the officer's report if nutrient mitigation could be secured and otherwise refuse the application.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Questions regarding rainwater diversion and whether there had been any consideration to the inclusion of solar panels, rainwater collection or heat pumps.
- Bat mitigation
- Clarification regarding what the mitigation was that members were voting on.

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 subject to nitrate mitigation or **REFUSE** permission is mitigation could not be secured, was proposed by Cllr Duncan Sowry-House, and seconded by Cllr David Morgan.

Decision: Grant planning permission subject to conditions once mitigation to secure nutrient neutrality has been secured. Refuse permission if no mitigation secured within 6 months or extended date approved by the Head of Planning.

92. **P/FUL/2024/00337 - Mushroom Field, Furzebrook Road, Stoborough**

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 and existing access were shown. Members were provided with details of the visibility splay plan, site context and location plan which included details of the site plan identifying the proposed new entrance referencing the constraints to the existing access. The officer also highlighted the planning designations including details of the Dorset National Landscape (AONB), the Dorset heathlands buffer as well as the surface water flood risk. The proposal was supported by sufficient justification and evidence to determine that subject to conditions, the proposal was acceptable in principle in the countryside and would further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Dorset National Landscape. Therefore, the officer's recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Mr Jones addressed the committee as the site owner. He informed members that the proposal was currently situated within a 5-acre field which had been abandoned since 2021 and since this time there had been a significant level of forced access. The new owners (since 2023) wanted to create a safe access to enable the site to serve its original agricultural purpose; vehicle access was essential. Mr Jones highlighted the history of the proposal, noting a larger entrance had previously been refused. Since, the applicant had revised their plans and reduced the gate size to comply. He hoped members would support the officer's recommendation otherwise the field would be abandoned and unproductive.

Members questions and comments

- Access for neighbouring properties.
- Queried rationale for this application coming to committee.
- Clarification regarding what comments had been made by the Highways Department.

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 Alex Brenton, and seconded by Cllr David Morgan.

Decision: To grant approval in line with the officer's recommendation.

93. P/VOC/2024/00411 - 33 Corfe View Road, Corfe Mullen, BH21 3LY

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 existing street scene as well as approved and proposed elevations and floor plans were shown. Members were informed

that the principle of development had already been established and they were provided with details of the site context and location plan. The Case Officer highlighted that the scale, design, impact on character and appearance were considered to be acceptable and that the proposed amendments to windows and doors would reduce neighbour perception of overlooking compared to the extant consent. The scale and form of the development had already been granted and the variation of conditions proposed minor material amendments to the previously approved windows, doors and external materials. The officer's recommendation was to grant subject to conditions.

Public Participation

Mr Selby spoke in objection to the proposal on behalf of 7 neighbours. He referenced correspondence on file and stated that the existing dwelling was overbearing, overlooked other properties and impacted amenity. He considered the officer report misleading and suggested members should view the property for themselves. Mr Selby also expressed his disappointment regarding damage to the roads from large lorries, resulting in dust, dirt and sand covering the area and questioned who was responsible. He asserted that the proposal was inappropriate, referring to it as a monstrosity, and informed members that he had paid a sum to plant trees to mitigating overlooking. The windows were not an issue, but the cladding would be unacceptable. He urged members to refuse.

Mr Shenoy spoke in support of the proposal. He expressed his opinion that the development was a well-designed modern building which makes a positive addition to Corfe Mullen. Mr Shenoy noted the criticism received from other residents; however, he considered that the development would be beneficial to the area. He hoped members would support the officer's recommendation.

Ms McCormick spoke on behalf of Mr Mills, the owner, in his absence. Within his representation he noted other residents' opinions, however, assured members that they weren't developers, they were just hoping to create a family home within an area which they felt captivated by. The applicant hoped members would support the officer's recommendation as the cladding would soften the appearance of the building. Mr Mills also responded to comments made by the town council within his representation by stating that the proposal was tucked away from view. He considered that it aligned with the NPPF and maintained the character of the area.

Cllr Sowry-House made a representation as the Local Ward Member. He was pleased to see local residents raising their concerns and attending committee. Cllr Sowry-House did not agree that the cladding proposed was appropriate for the site. He assured members that he did not have any concerns regarding windows, however, he hoped members would overturn the officer's recommendation and refuse.

Members questions and comments

- Concerns regarding the scale of the proposal.
- Concerns regarding the colour of the proposed cladding.
- Clarification regarding the details of condition 2 to ensure that it was more in keeping with the area.

- Members noted the amendments were proposed by the applicant to reduce the visual impact, however, they noted the comments made by local residents and their concerns about the visual impact.
- Vegetation screening opportunities were considered to mitigate the impact on neighbouring properties.
- The development was considered to be prominent within the street scene.
- Cllr Toni Coombs proposed to grant the officers recommendation, Cllr David Morgan seconded the proposal; however, the motion fell at the vote.

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 Spencer Flower, and seconded by Cllr Alex Brenton.

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

The proposed cladding of the first-floor extensions in a dark colour would amplify the visual impact of the enlarged building to the detriment of local visual amenity resulting in harm to the character of the area contrary to policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1, Core Strategy.

94. **P/HOU/2024/01422 - Alexander House, 33 Stoborough Meadow, Wareham, BH20 5HP**

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. Photographs of the dwelling and plans of the proposed elevations were shown, including details of the proposed cedar cladding. Members were provided with a summary of the key issues and third party comments which raised concerns regarding the proposal not being in keeping with the area, impacting the Dorset National Landscape, and the street scene due to its prominent location. The Case Officer advised members that the proposed modifications would not harm the character of the area subject to a condition to ensure the materials and colour for the cladding were acceptable. There was no wider impact on the Dorset National Landscape and were no significant impact on neighbours. The principle of development was considered acceptable. Therefore, the officer's recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Local residents spoke in objection to the proposal. They explained that the housing estate had won awards due to its high standard of design. They noted that Alexander House was in a prominent position and asserted that cladding was an appropriate material to use. It was highlighted that there were currently no other buildings within the vicinity which had cladding to the extent proposed, therefore it

was not in keeping with the character of the area and would have looked out of place, causing the area to lose its distinctive characteristics. Residents were concerned that if approved, it would set a precedence within the village. The site being situated near the National Landscape (AONB) was also discussed as well as the other materials which had been used to create other dwellings within the area. Residents hoped that members would listen to their concerns and overturn the officer recommendation on the basis of inappropriate designs and materials.

Mr George Robson spoke on behalf of his father Mr Andrew Robson, the applicant. He explained to members that he lived at the property with his parents. Mr Robson explained that when the existing rendering was applied, it had not been done so properly and therefore as it was a prominent property, something had to be done. Careful consideration had been undertaken to ensure that the materials were appropriate. The applicants highlighted the need for replacing more sustainable windows and their desire to make their property look more respectable.

The Local Ward Member made a representation in objection to the proposal of behalf of over 50 residents and the Parish Council. Cllr Ezzard highlighted that the proposal was designed by an award-winning architect and informed members that it was a focal point when entering the site. The Local Ward member noted the comments received by the applicant, however she felt that the original builders should have been informed if the cladding work had not been completed correctly. She highlighted the history of the site and that any change should have come to committee.

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

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding what weight could have been given to the Purbeck Local Plan.
- The site was made up of a design variance with a variety of materials.
- Cladding was not in keeping with the style or grandeur of the building. It was not appropriate for the house within the location.
- Members referred to policy E2 of the Arne neighbourhood Plan, the LP policies and Purbeck Design Guidance and did not consider that the proposal was in keeping with the area.
- Significant property on the site which was designed by an award-winning architecture.
- Members noted that they did not have issues with fascia and windows, their concerns lay with the scale of the proposed cladding.
- PD rights were removed to safeguard the character of the estate. The previous Purbeck Council had gone to great lengths to preserve this; therefore, the successor council should not alter or undermine those decisions.

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 Toni Coombs, and seconded by Cllr Duncan Sowry-House.

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

- The proposed cladding of the entire first floor of the dwelling would be unsympathetic with the property and estate design, would not reflect local distinctiveness and would not truly integrate with its surroundings, given its prominent location, contrary to Policy E12 of the Purbeck Local Plan, Policy 2 of the Arne Neighbourhood Plan and the Purbeck District Design Guide.

95. **P/FUL/2024/01190 - St Ives County First School, Sandy Lane, St Leonards and St Ives, Dorset, BH24 2LE.**

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 street scenes, proposed elevations and floor plans were shown. Members were also provided with details of the site context and location plan with the planning constraints highlighted. The proposal was within the urban area where the principle of development had been considered acceptable, subject to any material planning considerations. The design was appropriate and was well screened from public vantage points. No significant trees had been affected and the proposal was acceptable subject to condition for biodiversity enhancement measures. The officer explained the relationship with neighbouring properties and trees; no significant harm from the small classrooms was identified. The officer's recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the report.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Members were pleased to support the officer's recommendation as they felt it was needed to support the educational needs of small groups within the school setting.
- Confirmation regarding red grandis cladding.

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 David Morgan, and seconded by Cllr Duncan Sowry-House.

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

96. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

97. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 2.38 pm

Chairman

.....