

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 5 MARCH 2024

Present: Cllrs Belinda Ridout (Chairman), Mary Penfold (Vice-Chairman), Tim Cook, Toni Coombs, Les Fry, Brian Heatley, Carole Jones, Stella Jones, Val Potheary and David Taylor

Apologies: Cllrs Jon Andrews and Emma Parker

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

Steven Banks (Planning Officer), Lucy Bruce, Ross Cahalane (Lead Project Officer), Enrico Dimarino (Engineer (Development Liaison), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), Hannah Massey (Lawyer - Regulatory), Fiona McDonnell (Senior Planning Officer), Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer), Steve Savage (Transport Development Liaison Manager), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)) and Cass Worman (Planning Officer).

61. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Tim Cook declared that he was pre-determined for agenda items 7 and 8. It was agreed that he would not take part in the discussion or debate but would speak as the local ward member.

Cllr Mary Penfold declared that she was pre-determined for agenda item 9 and 10. It was agreed that she would not take part in the discussion or debate.

62. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 19th December were confirmed and signed.

63. 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.

64. Planning Applications

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

65. **P/FUL/2021/04205 - Saxon Maybank East Farm Grain Mills, Bradford Abbas, Sherborne, DT9 6JN**

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, proposed landscaping plans, elevations and floor plans were shown. Members were informed that there was a tree preservation order which had been put in place to mitigate harm. The Case Officer also discussed public rights of way and included images of views looking south, southwest, west, north, and northwest onto the site. The presentation also outlined key issues and referred to policies ECON6 and ECON 7 which referred to caravan and camping sites and built tourist accommodation.

The officer's recommendation was to:

A) Grant planning permission subject to conditions and subject to the completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), in a form to be agreed by the legal services manager to secure landscaping.

B) Refuse to grant planning permission if a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) is not completed by 05/09/2024 or such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning.

Public Participation

Members of the public spoke in objection to the application. An area of concern was nutrient neutrality with concerns raised as to whether the harm from increased phosphate discharge could be successfully mitigated and thus avoid harm to the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site. Mr Park highlighted that the site consisted of high-quality barn conversions and semi-permanent wooden lodges used by owners for extended periods of time, it was not a caravan park for short term holiday lets. Concerns were raised as to the practicalities of the proposed drainage mitigation solution. Speakers queried Natural England's advice that any harm could be mitigated. Ms McDowall also made a representation and commented on the proposal, highlighting that she had a second home situated on the proposal land and was concerned about additional caravans. She commented on the impacts that this would have in relation to privacy and lack of natural light which would have become overbearing. Mr Howard also discussed the site layout plan and the boundaries which they felt violated the Council parking requirements as to width and turning space provision. Objectors felt as though the proposal was insufficient and if approved, would have negative impacts. In conclusion, they hoped members would make the decision to refuse permission.

The applicant spoke in support of the application and highlighted the history of the site which was originally submitted in 2021. Mr Funnell was hopeful that a decision would have been made to support. He noted that it was a comprehensive planning scheme but felt as though it had a lot of positive benefits to the surrounding areas. The applicant discussed how the area attracted a lot of visitors and holiday makers all year and thanked the members for their time and consideration.

A statement was read on behalf of Cllr Robin Legg in his absence. Saxon Maybank had a caravan site licence but was not a typical holiday caravan park where residents live near one another for a week or two. Only two of the sixteen units on site were available as short-term holiday lets. The remainder are second homes in a countryside setting and six of those, barn conversions. The proposed development would have had a significant and overbearing impact on the amenity of unit 11. Residents which live and visit here should enjoy the same level of amenity as any other housing development and referenced policy ENV16. Over development of the site was also discussed. Permission was granted on appeal for development of 11 units. Cllr Legg felt that it ought not to have received approval looking at policy. However, the local landscape character would have benefited by the removal of an ugly and derelict feed mill. Increasing the number of units to 19 was a clear over development. The Local Ward members statement also reflected views that the proposal would not improve the quality and appearance of the site. The treatment of wastewater was also a cause for concern as it was calculated that drainage fields proposed wouldn't cover the area. It would cause harm to the protected area and residential units. Cllr Legg was also concerned by the lack of archaeological conditions and the impact of public rights of way.

Members questions and comments

- Drainage of the site
- Clarification regarding completed surveys.
- Residential amenity
- Confirmation on use of the building's occupancy.
- Comments regarding fire risk assessment
- Concerns regarding amenity of the lodges.
- Clarification of public footpaths on site.
- Proximity of archaeological site.
- Occupancy figures.
- Concerns regarding parking, turning spaces and onsite disabled parking.
- Questions as to why the application had taken this length of time to come to committee for a decision.
- Distance of units and length of proposed caravans.
- Lack of communal space
- Members felt it was an overdevelopment and was a poorly designed scheme.

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 overturn the officer's recommendation for **APPROVAL** and **REFUSE** planning permission, was proposed by Cllr Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr David Taylor.

Decision: To refuse planning permission subject to the following reasons:

1. Insufficient drainage information has been provided to demonstrate that the site would be appropriately drained, taking account of surface water, and with the surrounding agricultural land being sited at a higher gradient.
2. The proposal would result in an adverse impact on the amenity of unit 11 through sharing an overbearing relationship which would result in a reduced level of amenity afforded to the living areas of unit 11, contrary to policy ENV.16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

66. **P/FUL/2023/05314 - Land at Mampits Lane, Shaftesbury, SP7 8GL**

The Case Officer provided members with an update regarding corrections to the consultation section of the report:

- Following further consultations, no objections had been received for this proposal.
- Discrepancy in number of supporters of the proposal.

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 elevation plans were shown. Members were informed of the key planning considerations which included impacts of community hub upon the character of the area, site layout and nature park provision, number of parking spaces, impacts on residential amenity, flood risk and biodiversity. The Case Officer provided details regarding tree protection which would have been maintained throughout the construction period and retained, in addition to this he also highlighted the inclusion of a proposed meadow.

Public Participation

Members of the public spoke in support of the application. Mr Dibben highlighted the number of signatures which had been received in support of the application and was hopeful that it would have a lot of public benefits. Car parking was also discussed which complied with the local neighbourhood plan and had adequate parking which would have controlled access to mitigate overflow parking by residents and conformed with the neighbourhood plan. Mr Reeve's highlighted that the proposed building would have been situated behind the existing tree line and emphasised the need for preserving and maintaining community green space. Public supporters also raised to members the number of supports that had been received by residents. Ms Chilver also addressed the committee and reiterated the need for the proposal. She highlighted those homes within the area had small gardens and lacked play areas. Supporters were pleased with the designs and felt as though the site was ecologically friendly. Supporters drew attention to the proposals use which would have allowed for multiple event and meeting use. They hoped members would support and grant permission.

The applicant informed members the local need for a town hall. He referred to the neighbourhood plan and discussed the number of signatures which had been collated from a petition which was presented to Dorset Council last year. Mr Yeo felt as though the proposal would be centrally located and would have helped to preserve the village green with the inclusion of nature parks. The applicant was also pleased to note that careful consideration had gone into the proposal, and it also allowed space for the use of the air ambulance if required. The application had received support from the community and hoped members would grant.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding existing road use.
- Members were pleased with the proposal and felt it was a benefit to the local community.

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 conditions, as recommended, was proposed by Cllr David Taylor, and seconded by Cllr Valerie Pothecry.

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

67. P/FUL/2023/06670 - Land at Mampits Lane Shaftesbury, Shaftesbury Town Council

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, layout and internal and external elevations were shown. The AONB was also identified to provide context. Members were informed of the key planning issues, in particular the impact on the community and public amenity as well as layout, public open space, parking, flooding, and biodiversity.

The Case Officer highlighted to members the proposed provision of public open space which would have included the retention of open green space as well as improving the rough grassland. In addition to this, the protection during construction of trees and hedgerows was also discussed. The presentation also provided details of parking provision which had met Dorset parking standards, totalling 15 spaces. Details of the inclusion of solar panels, heat source pumps and accessibility of bin stores were discussed. The proposal conformed with policy 25 of the local plan and NPPF and had undergone a biodiversity mitigation plan. The recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Residents spoke in objection to the proposal. They did not feel as though the site would have been properly managed and conflicted with planning policies. Mr Dibben discussed the impacts on wildlife corridors and had concerns regarding uncontrolled parking. Residents had a lack of faith in the Town Council's proposal and suggested that they were opposed to the provision of a community hall on this site 3 years ago. Mr Reeve noted his disappointment that the proposed building was in front of an existing tree line and felt as though it lacked insufficient green space which was a local need. Ms Chilver felt as though the proposal wasn't well put together and would have negative impacts on neighbouring properties. She felt as though it was a poor use of the site and destroyed the boundary of the countryside to the existing development. Objectors felt as though the site should be for the benefit of residents and did not feel as though an owned and staffed proposal was suitable. Concerns were also raised regarding a dangerous corner which had been subject to several near accidents, they highlighted if granted, this proposal would only make things worse and more dangerous for road users. They hoped members would overturn the officer's recommendation for approval.

Cllr Yeo addressed the committee and highlighted that residents did not want the proposal. He stated that he lived in the area and knew the views of the local community. He was disappointed that the Shaftesbury Town Council didn't want to run the proposal and felt as though it had been poorly designed and destroyed the village green space. Cllr Yeo urged the committee to not support the proposal and to listen to the views of residents and not impact the view of the countryside further.

Cllr Lewer highlighted that the Town Council had submitted the proposal on behalf of the Shaftesbury residents and had public consultation from the beginning. He assured members that the money would have been spent carefully to ensure local needs were met. He felt that the proposal was a sufficient use of the land and enhanced biodiversity. Cllr Lewer believed that the proposal was a good and better plan which would have been a good addition to the community which could have been used by the NHS and other agencies. He assured members that the project had been designed to be flexible and to future proof it.

The Local Ward member spoke in support of the application. He noted that the Town Council had set up a working group and had received a lot of responses. Cllr Cook also highlighted that the proposal had been designed by community volunteers and by those living in the area. He also drew attention to the biodiversity benefits and onsite parking, however, noted that the parking had been designed to promote residents walking and cycling to and from the site. The Local Ward members representation discussed how the proposal had been designed to provide a safe space and to meet the needs of Shaftesbury.

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

Members questions and comments

- Confirmation regarding outline consent for the scheme.
- Concerns regarding adequate parking spaces and amenities for residents.
- Informal open space areas.
- Clarification on parking use and enforcement.
- Regret that Dorset Council has been drawn into a debate between the Town Council.
- Referred to section 12 of the NPPF and did not feel as though the proposal met the requirements.
- Lack of biodiversity and highlighted the importance of protecting open green spaces.

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, as well as advice from the Area Manager that the proposal was to be determined on its own merits, by reference to the Development Plan and other material considerations and should not be compared to the former application at Agenda item 7, a motion to **REFUSE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Toni Coombs, and seconded by Cllr Carole Jones.

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

1. The proposed layout would result in the urbanisation of the area due to the extent of the uninterrupted liner parking along the sites frontage, which would provide insufficient landscaping, and would fail to make a positive contribution towards the environment, and the appearance of the area, contrary to Policy SFDH5 of the Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan, Policy 24 of the North Dorset Local Plan, and the NPPF.

68. **P/FUL/2023/04880 - Shillingstone Station, Station Road, Shillingstone, Blandford Forum, DT11 0SA**

The Case Officer updated the members on the following:

- An additional representation had been received. This raised questions as to the justification & need for the proposed car park, taking into consideration existing parking facilities and that passenger trips on the North Dorset Railway would not be available for many years. The justification & need for the scheme had been considered by Officers when bringing forward the recommendation.

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 layout, new access, and

views from the existing trailway and AONB were shown. The officer's presentation provided details of pedestrian links, screening, and existing and proposed number of parking spaces. Members were informed of the proposed landscaping and biodiversity mitigation and enhancements on the site. As well as this, the Case Officer discussed site flood risks but assured members that the benefits of the proposal outweighed the risk. Natural England confirmed that they are happy in principle with the mitigation & compensation measures secured in the Biodiversity Plan, subject to the assessment in the "planning balance" that the benefit of the scheme outweighs the biodiversity loss. Details of the surfacing materials and management of the site were provided. The recommendation was for approval subject to conditions set out in the report.

Public Participation

Mr Jenkins spoke in support to the proposal. He highlighted that the site was run by volunteers which focused on restoring railways heritage using museums and restoration of buildings. He also drew attention to the number of visits and work experience opportunities which were made available to local visitors. Mr Jenkins discussed that the existing parking land would soon no longer be available and would therefore put the future of the progression of the trailway at risk. He informed members of their plans for extension and had consulted with residents to find a suitable solution. Mr Jenkins hoped members would support the officer's recommendation.

Mr Giles made a short representation, highlighting the views of Mr Jenkins and felt as though he had nothing further to add.

Members questions and comments

- Questions regarding mitigation of wildlife park.
- Members were really pleased with the proposal and were happy to grant.

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 conditions, as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr Carole Jones.

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

69. **P/FUL/2023/01342 - Land and Buildings North Of Cutlers Close Sydling St Nicholas**

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 within but did not harm the settlement boundary. Photographs of views which looked toward the site, existing building, proposed site plan and street scenes were provided. Details of the proposed materials which included brick, clay tiles and boarding were discussed as well impacts on the AONB and nearby listed buildings as well as lack of public transport to and from the site. The proposal did not have the inclusion of affordable housing and was susceptible to flooding. In conclusion, the Case Officer confirmed that the proposal caused less than substantial harm to the conservation area and the recommendation was to refuse planning permission.

Public Participation

The local councillor made a representation in objection to the proposal. He felt as though the proposal was an overdevelopment and highlight the lack of public transport and if granted, the strong reliance on private vehicles. Cllr Shears wasn't satisfied with the development and discussed issues regarding flooding and groundwater levels. The proposal would have increased flood risks and pollution in the local area. In addition to this, the local council also felt that additional dwellings would have only added additional pressures to the sewage system. Parking impacts on pedestrian safety and dwelling designs were also discussed. Cllr Shears was disappointed that there was a lack of affordable housing and an unsustainable location. He hoped members would refuse planning permission.

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 **REFUSE** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Valerie Pothecry, and seconded by Cllr Stella Jones.

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

70. P/RES/2023/03735 - Land at E373160 N117864 Pond Walk Stalbridge DT10 2PY

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. Images of the site identified nearby listed buildings and public footpaths. Photographs of the existing site, eastern and northern boundaries, proposed floor plans, garages and elevations were also included. Members were also informed that the site was within the conservation area and were provided with details of the site entrance, proposed materials and the location and landscape plan. The Case Officer also discussed the change in scale of buildings to reduce impacts on the nearby listed building. Details regarding the

protection of the Chestnut Tree on site were also provided. The recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

The applicant thanked the officers for their comprehensive report and was pleased with the recommendation that was before committee. Mr Moir explained that the proposal would have been situated in an already established development and assured members that he had engaged with Stalbridge town council, the local ward member, and the allotment society. He referred to policy 25 of the local plan and highlighted the distance from protected trees. Mr Moir emphasised the need for family housing and hoped the committee would support the officer's recommendation.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding renewable energy sources.
- Questions regarding maintenance of public footpaths.
- Benefits the local community.

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 Les Fry,

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

71. P/RES/2022/04960 - West of Shaftesbury Road (Land on Ham Farm), Land South of Gillingham, Shaftesbury Road, Gillingham

The Case Officer updated the members of the correction of a typo error from paragraph 15.3 from within the 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 site along with the illustrative masterplan and proposed street scenes were shown. Details of the number of proposed dwellings, affordable housing, proposed phasing plan, housing mix, parking and building materials were discussed. Members were reminded of the existing Outline approval and the more recently approved 34 dwelling site and public open space to the north of the current proposal. The Case Officer also informed members of the strategic allocation plan, proposed LEAP, traffic calming measures which had received no objections raised by highways. The proposal complied in accordance with the local plan for Gillingham. The recommendation was to grant conditional

planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement signed within six months of a Committee resolution to grant. If the S106 was not signed within that time, then the application would be refused unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Head of Planning.

Public Participation

The agent made a representation to committee, outlining the continued hard work on the proposed site and thanked the officers for their work. Mr Jackson highlighted that the principal of development had already been consented and the application would have provided 108 homes with the inclusion of affordable housing. In addition to this, the agent also discussed open space throughout the site, tree planting and site connections. Mr Jackson felt as though the proposal was compliant and represented a good sustainable development which had many benefits. He hoped members would support the officer's recommendation.

Members questions and comments

- Disappointed with the lack of affordable housing provision across the site.
- Questions regarding limitations to water consumption.
- Clarification regarding local amenities.
- Clarification regarding maintenance of the highway.
- Members were pleased to see the provision of heat source pumps but were disappointed that there was no inclusion of solar panels.
- Waste collection
- Clarification regarding Dorset Council's updated Sustainability Checklist.
- Comments regarding development being at adoptive standards.
- Additional condition to secure water efficiency measures including rainwater harvesting.

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 Valerie Pothecriy, and seconded by Cllr Les Fry, subject to conditions set out in the officer's report and an additional condition to secure water efficiency measures including rainwater harvesting that prior to the commencement of development above damp course level, details of measures to limit the water use of the dwellings, including rainwater harvesting, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to occupation and maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To minimise the impacts of climate change from water consumption arising from the development as required by Policy 3 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 2016.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for approval, subject to conditions set out in the officer's report and the additional condition to secure water efficiency measures.

72. **P/RES/2023/00628 - West of Shaftesbury Road (Land on Ham Farm), Land South of Gillingham, Shaftesbury Road, Gillingham**

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 access and views towards the site were shown. Members were provided with details of the location plan, approved illustrative masterplan, and were reminded of the existing approved dwellings. The officer's presentation also provided context regarding phasing plans. The recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

The applicant withdrew his request to speak.

Members questions and comments

- Surface water drainage.

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 conditions, 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 set out in the officer's report.

73. **P/LBC/2023/00884 - Crockers Farm, Crockers Farm Lane, Twyford, Dorset, SP7 0JF**

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. Images of the site and photographs of the existing and proposed elevations were shown. Members were informed that the site was situated on a working farm which was not within the conservation area but was situated on an area of special scientific interest. The Case Officer discussed the conditions regarding bat boxes and nesting birds and outlined the recommendation which 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 Toni Coombs, and seconded by Cllr Carole Jones.

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

74. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

75. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 4.15 pm

Chairman

.....