

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 4 JUNE 2024

Present: Cllrs Richard Crabb (Chair), David Taylor (Vice-Chair), Les Fry, Jack Jeanes, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout, James Vitali and Carl Woode

Apologies: Cllr Barrie Cooper

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

Jamie Francis (Planning Officer), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), Hannah Massey (Lawyer - Regulatory), Kathryn Melhuish (Conservation and Design Team Leader), Steve Savage (Transport Development Liaison Manager), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)), Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer), Kirsten Williams (Lead Project Officer) and Cass Worman (Planning Officer).

1. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Richard Crabb declared an interest to agenda item 6, in that he had debated and voted on this matter when it was considered by Sherborne Town Council's planning committee. It was agreed that he would not take part in the debate or discussion and would leave the room when the item was considered.

Cllr Val Potheary made a statement in respect of agenda item 7 in that she had chaired the Gillingham Town Council planning meeting that considered this matter. However, she did not participate in the debate and did not vote on the item. She had not pre-disposition or pre-determination in respect of the matter. It was agreed that she would take part in the debate and discussion.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 9th April 2024 were confirmed and signed.

3. 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.

4. **Planning Applications**

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

5. **P/FUL/2024/00846 - Sherborne House, Newland Sherborne, Dorset, DT9 3JG**

Cllr Richard Crabb left the room and Vice-Chair Cllr David Taylor led agenda item 6.

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 elevations and layout were shown. In addition to this, the Case Officer identified different viewpoints from within and outside of the proposed site. Members were informed that the proposal was a multi-use space which had a restored café and bar area which would have generated an income for the proposal and Sherborne. Officers had worked closely with architects to create a well-designed site to ensure it was in keeping with the local area. Comments made by Natural England were highlighted, however, The Case Officer informed members that the proposal was a sufficient distance from nearby listed buildings and was the most viable option. The presentation provided details of what had been a successful renovation project which had created more enjoyment of the site and a community asset which was free for public use and had significant community and educational benefits which outweighed any harm. Therefore, the officer's recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Mr Pitman addressed the committee and discussed what had been a monumental refurbishment which was in keeping with the area and was free to the public for their enjoyment. The agent noted comments made by Historic England and was pleased that they had not objected to the proposal before members. In addition to this, Mr Pitman felt as though the location of the proposal unit was well chosen and highlighted that the storage was key to the success and viability of Sherborne. He explained that the completion works were scheduled to finish next month and was pleased with the positive feedback which had been received. He hoped that members would support the officer's recommendation.

Members questions and comments

- Members felt that there was a need for the storage facility and felt as though it had been placed strategically. They also praised the existing development and the progress of it as well as noting the materials used.
- Concerns regarding whether the mural would have been painted directly onto the storage unit and the maintenance of this.
- Comments regarding the proposal not being visually intrusive and was in keeping with the area.

- Overall, members were pleased with the proposal and praised the work which had been completed as it had kept the best interests of the town at the centre of their work.

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** permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Les Fry, and seconded by Cllr Sherry Jespersen.

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

6. **P/RES/2022/07898 - West of Shaftesbury Road (Land on Ham Farm), Land South of Gillingham, Shaftesbury Road, Gillingham**

The Case Officer provided members with the following update:

- Typo corrections had been made to pages 3, 20 and 26 of 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, as well as highlighting that the application which was before members was a reserved matter application which followed the grant of an outline application which allowed for a local centre for community uses. Details of the previous approved plans were discussed. Photographs of the layout scheme, street scene elevations, illustrative loop roads and masterplans were shown. Members were shown the strategic allocation plan as well as the approved site plan for a 34 dwelling proposal which was located adjacent to the site. Details of affordable housing, building heights, parking strategies and refuse collection were provided.

The Case Officer also referred to the Materials Plan, Character Area Details, and the Landscape Masterplan. In addition to this, members were also informed of the biodiversity and compensation measures which included the establishment of hedgerows, biodiversity corridors and the installation of bat and bird boxes. The presentation showed images as to where these would be allocated across the site. Consideration had been undertaken regarding the lighting proposal in relation to bats, residential immunity space and footpath networks. Additional improvements such as additional parking and street planting had also been made. The development would not have led to any material harm to residential amenity. It was acceptable in terms of scale, layout, appearance, and landscaping. There were no material considerations which would warrant refusal; therefore, the officer's recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Mr Moore addressed the committee and informed members that he owned a contracting business which backed onto the development. He had no objections to the proposal, however, was concerned regarding the noise of a working yard to future residents. Mr Moore felt as though the inclusion of acoustic fencing or strategic planting would mitigate noise impacts to avoid future problems between residents and workers.

The agent addressed the committee and highlighted that the proposal was for residential use and had complied with the Section 106 agreement. He discussed the location of the units and the financial incentives which had been offered by the applicant. Praising their delivery of affordable housing on the proposed site and others. Mr Ruddock also responded to comments made by Environmental Health Officers and also discussed separation distances, the urban design and vegetation. The agent thanked the officers for their work and hoped members would support the recommendation to support the proposal.

Members questions and comments

- Questions regarding the inclusion of energy efficient resources such as solar panels and electric car charging points. Members felt that this was a missed opportunity and hoped future developers would consider this when making further applications.
- Cllr Jespersen referred to paragraph 16.5 of The Case Officer's report and noted the comments made by the Housing Enabling Team regarding the large number of flats and 2-bedroom provision. She felt it would be useful to note that the acceptability of this had been explained by officers previously and it was only relevant to the proposed site as it was part of a much larger scheme.
- Confirmation regarding the implementation of hedging and fencing.
- Questions regarding affordable unit accessibility and clarification regarding the acoustic design statement.
- Members were pleased with the inclusion of affordable housing and praised the well-designed proposal which included landscaping and open design.
- Clarification regarding flood risk management.

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 Val Pothecry.

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

7. **P/FUL/2024/00958 - The Tree House, Duck Lane, Stalbridge, DT10 2LP**

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 land which featured mature trees and shrubs, proposed site access and images of neighbouring properties which featured perimeter fencing were shown. Members were informed that the application had been submitted by Dorset Council and that the proposal was outside the settlement boundary but was within the conservation area. The development was not considered to be harmful to the conservation area and the location of the proposal was considered sustainable. The Case Officer highlighted that The Tree House was a grade 2 listed building however, the proposed site would not impact the building, nor would it have been harmful to the setting or heritage assets. Images of surrounding agricultural land to the north and northwest of the site were provided. Members were informed that the proposal would have provided better educational facilities, therefore, the recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

No public speakers registered.

Members questions and comments

- The Local Ward Member felt that it was a sensible proposal within a sustainable location which had responded to the increase in housing stock in Stalbridge. Cllr Vitali noted that an expansion was needed for the school to ensure future proofing. Strong support had been received from both the council and local residents.
- Clarification regarding parameter fencing.

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 James Vitali, and seconded by Cllr Sherry Jespersen.

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

8. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

9. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 - 11.38 am

Chairman

.....