

## **NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 16 JULY 2024**

**Present:** Cllrs Richard Crabb (Chair), David Taylor (Vice-Chair), Barrie Cooper, Jack Jeanes, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout and Carl Woode.

**Apologies:** Cllrs Les Fry and James Vitali.

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

Steven Banks (Planning Officer), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Paul Eastwood (Engineer (Development Liaison)), Jamie Francis (Planning Officer), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), Robert Lennis (Lead Project Officer), Pete Markham (Planning Officer), Steve Savage (Transport Development Liaison Manager), Alex Skidmore (Lead Project Officer), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)) and Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer).

**10. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made at the meeting.

**11. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> June were confirmed and signed.

**12. 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.

**13. Planning Applications**

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

**14. P/RES/2022/03733 - Land Northeast of Lower Bryanston Farm, Fair Mile Road, Bryanston, Dorset**

The Case Officer provided members with the following updates:

- There was missing text under the description of the development.

- Landscape revision plans.
- Note within section 10 of the report, section 72 of the listed buildings and conservation act was added.

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 affordable housing layout, front elevations and location plan were shown. Members were informed that there had been objections raised from Dorset AONB and concerns from landscape officers were addressed. Access had been previously approved at the outline stage and the Case Officer highlighted the structured tree planting across perimeters, referencing additional street trees and hedging on boundaries. The presentation also provided information regarding flood mitigation and photographs of street scenes and the parking layout as well as outlining the proposed material schedule and landscaping details. The officer's recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Mr Savage (Transport Development Manager) discussed the site access which had appropriate visibility splays. He also highlighted footway connections across the site which linked to traffic calming areas and access to the school. In addition to this, the Transport Development Manager also discussed the Highway Improvement Plan which had the intension of amending the pedestrian cycle route. Members were assured that all access had been approved. The layout was suitable for adoption and had carefully been considered to ensure safety for all road users. This was reflected with the vehicular speeds being kept below 20mph. The site consisted of a traditional layout with footways on both sides of the road. Mr Savage also set out the number of parking spaces per household as well as referring to on street parking which had been checked with refuse and emergency vehicles. On balance, Highways were content with the layout, and it was suitable for adoption.

### **Public Participation**

Mr Wright made a representation and explained how he had worked closely with officers to deliver the proposal which would have provided over 70 high quality homes. He highlighted the inclusion of affordable, shared ownership and homes to rent which would've been spread across the site whilst being in keeping with the character of the area. There had been no objections from the council housing officer and the scheme was compliant with standards. Mr Wright confirmed that he had met with local residents as well as the Parish Council and respected their concerns which he had responded to. He highlighted drainage features, additional planting and the inclusion of solar panels and electric charging for all homes. The agent noted that the highways team supported the proposal and hoped members would support the officer's recommendation.

Cllr Gale addressed the committee and expressed his concerns regarding the proposal. He did not feel as though the site should have come to committee this early and was disappointed that there had been no further ecological surveys conducted since 2012. Cllr Gale also referred to the site access and hoped members would review before supporting further work.

### **Members questions and comments**

- Clarification regarding whether conditions 14 and 15 of the officer's report had been met from outline.
- Members noted that there had been no conflict with the local plan.
- Questions regarding ecological considerations on site.
- Clarification regarding the number of affordable housings on the site.
- Clarification regarding pedestrian access points.
- Questions regarding the speed limit on site.
- Members highlighted that it had been a complex application and developers had worked hard with officers to produce a high-quality development which had received no objections.

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 Sherry Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Belinda Rideout.

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

### 15. **P/FUL/2021/02623 - Four Paddocks Land South of St Georges Road, Dorchester**

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. The presentation highlighted the requirement for a new site access, outlining a new junction arrangement. The Case Officer highlighted the different sections of the proposed site with the inclusion of images looking towards the site as well as proposed street scenes and elevations, noting that it was on a gradient. Members were also informed of additional tree and shrub plantation, ecological enhancements and landscape buffering between the proposed site and heritage assets. Comments made by Highways had been highlighted in the report in which the Case Officer discussed the reconfiguration of cycle pedestrian routes. The presentation also identified the level crossing which neighboured the site as well as highlighting the percentage of affordable housing. The officer's recommendation was to grant conditional planning permission subject to consultation with the Secretary of State for Transport and to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement signed within six months of a Committee resolution to grant. If the S106 is not signed within that time period, then the application shall be refused unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Head of Planning.

Mr Savage (Transport Development Manager) discussed the traffic calming measures and traffic generation, highlighting both morning and evening peaks. He explained to members that the site was low traffic generating and had sufficient

width for passing construction vehicles. The Transport Development Manager drew members attention to the proposed site access as well as visibility. A construction management plan had been conducted and he was satisfied by improvements which were deliverable and appropriate to the proposal.

### **Public Participation**

Mr Absen addressed the committee and noted that development was needed in the area, however he was concerned regarding the construction period as well as the addition of vehicular movements and how this would have negatively impacted local residents. Mr Absen also discussed concerns regarding the loss of green land as the site was currently enjoyed by residents.

### **Members questions and comments**

- Clarification regarding construction times and site access.
- Questions regarding ecological considerations on site.
- Confirmation on adoptive areas on the proposed site.
- Comments regarding preferences of the inclusion of single or two storey preferences as three storey dwellings could be intrusive.
- Members were disappointed to see a planning application before the number of affordable housings had been agreed.
- Referenced paragraph 16.8 of the officer's report – concerns regarding dwellings which had noted the minimum living space requirements.
- Reassurance regarding the level of risk to the general public using the level crossing.
- Noise pollution mitigation.
- Questions regarding sewage works and nutrient neutrality.
- Surface and wastewater mitigation.
- Accessibility for wheelchair users.
- Members were pleased to see the inclusion of electric car charging points.
- Potential for affordable housing was high and the design of the proposal was a good standard.
- Clarification regarding the maintenance of plot 5.
- Members requested an informative note to be added to the minutes which highlights their disappointment regarding the consideration of houses not meeting housing standards being included within affordable housing.
- Queried whether permitted development rights should be removed for Plot 75 to prevent unwelcome enlargements which could impact harmfully upon the setting of the adjacent listed building (Maxgate).

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 Rory Major, and seconded by Cllr Sherry Jespersen subject to additional conditions of limited permitted development rights for Plot 75.

**Decision:** To grant the officer's recommendation for approval subject to the additional condition of limited permitted development rights for Plot 75.

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

16. **P/FUL/2022/02416 - Mushroom Farm, Cow Lane, Poyntington, Sherborne, DT9 4LF**

The Case Officer provided members with the following updates:

- There was a typo in the officer's report relating to cubic meters.

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 and proposed site plans, floor plans, proposed structure elevations and roof plans were shown. Members were also provided with details of the proposed woodland planting as well as the landscape mitigation plan. The presentation included images from different viewpoints and the Case Officer set out the key issues of principle of development, referring to the character and appearance as well as nutrient neutrality. The officer's recommendation was to A: GRANT, 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 the following:

- Secure a 0.9ha woodland managed in the long term
- Monitoring fee of £1,510

And the conditions (and their reasons) listed at the end of the report.

Recommendation B: Refuse permission for failing to secure the obligations above the agreement is not completed by (31 August 2024) or such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning.

**Public Participation**

Objectors made representations to committee stating that the proposal did not fit in with the character of the area, was damaging to the village and made note of the number of written objections made from other residents. Mr Faber highlighted that members should have represented the best interests of local residents and invited them to view the site before reaching a decision. Objectors were also concerned about the scale of the development as it was greater than the existing barn and noted that the polytunnels were disused. They urged members to refuse the proposal.

The agent made representation and explained that they were keen to remove an eyesore for a beautiful village. Ms Curtis highlighted to members that changes had

been made to accommodate officer requests and that they had been working tirelessly to present a design and layout scheme which was of high quality. The agent noted the site benefits and was aware of an increase in scale, however, informed members that it was less than a 10% increase. Ms Curtis hoped members would support the officer's recommendation of granting the high-quality scheme which would have introduced two new families to the area.

The Local Ward member also made representation in objection and felt that the proposal was not acceptable and should have been refused. Councillor Legg was concerned regarding the scale of the development and did not feel as though the proposed tree planting was sufficient to improve the quality of the discharge of the units.

### **Members questions and comments**

- Concerns regarding the use of the barn and the scale of the proposal as the footprint was larger than the original building.
- Polytunnels weren't permanent structures.
- Clarification regarding whether the barn met permitted development requirements.
- Impacts on local heritage assets.
- Concerns regarding screening.
- Members felt that the proposal was unsympathetic to the character of the area and would have been harmful.
- Concerns regarding there being a significant number of windows on site which would have been intrusive to the countryside.
- Members were not satisfied with the premise.
- The proposal was larger than the existing barn.
- Impacts to the landscape due to excessive amount of glazing and light pollution.

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 representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **REFUSE** the officer's recommendation as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Val Pothecriy, and seconded by Cllr Sherry Jespersen.

**Decision:** To overturn the officer's recommendation and refuse planning permission for the following reasons.

- The proposal by reason of its mass, layout, scale, and design would have harmed the character and appearance of the area. The increase in plot size, large size of the dwellings, and the level of glazing would have resulted in an urbanisation that would be out of keeping with the village and the design would not have been in harmony with the area as a whole. The proposal would've also resulted in light pollution. Therefore, the proposal

would be contrary to the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan policy ENV1, ENV10 and ENV12 and the NPPF.

**17. P/FUL/2024/00218 - 5 Mill Lake, Factory Hill, Bourton, Dorset, SP8 5FS**

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. The site was within the settlement boundary of Bourton and was considered to be an acceptable location for a small-scale office use. Photographs of the illustrative furniture layout and internal layout were shown as well as existing and proposed floor plans. Members were informed that the proposal was for a change of use to allow for offices and dwellings to coexist. The Case Officer set out the history of the site and highlighted comments made by Bourton Parish Council relating to a lack of parking provision and impacts on neighbouring amenity which had combined commercial and residential use. Parking had been considered acceptable and reference was made to the NPPF, particularly policy 12 and paragraphs 55 and 11. There was no significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity and sufficient parking would have been provided to serve the development. There were no material considerations which would have warranted refusal of the application; therefore, the recommendation was to grant subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

**Public Participation**

Mr Dandy addressed the committee and spoke in support of the proposal, explaining that he was the director of the company and was proud to have seen it grow in recent years. He discussed his employees and how they were made up of good local people. Mr Dandy felt that the proposal was in a good location, and it would have been used appropriately. He hoped the committee would support the officer's recommendation.

**Members questions and comments**

- Potential amenity impact for local residents.
- Members noted the concerns raised by Bourton Parish Council.
- Concerns regarding the loss of a residential building.
- Members noted that a change of use would have been beneficial during the construction period, however, some were concerned about what this would have meant afterwards.
- Questions regarding the possibility of being able to add a condition for time limitation.
- Clarification regarding whether the applicant could have reapplied in the future for residential use.
- Concerns regarding the loss of a residential property.
- Cllr Sherry Jespersen proposed to refuse on the basis that the proposal conflicted with the Bourton Neighbourhood Plan. Cllr Rideout seconded the proposal; however, the motion fell at the vote.
- Members noted that it was a good local business and felt that it should have been supported.

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 Daid Taylor.

**Decision:** To grant the officer's recommendation and approve permission.

18. **P/HOU/2024/02580 - 2 Vale Cottages, Ring Street, Stalbridge, Dorset, DT10 2LZ**

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 and proposed dwelling floor plan and elevations were shown. Images of the rear of the property and existing site were included to show the proposed single storey extension. Members were informed of the planning considerations such as the impacts on heritage assets and character of area due to the proposal being situated in the Stalbridge conservation area. It was highlighted that the small scale was not considered harmful, it would not have impacted the listed building or setting and would not have caused overlooking or overbearing issues to neighbouring properties. The Case Officer set out the flood risk and drainage strategies whilst highlighting the proposed building materials. In conclusion, the proposal complied with policies of the local plan and NPPF, and no material planning considerations indicate otherwise. The officer's 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**

- Members praised the officers report and informative presentation.

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 Taylor, and seconded by Cllr Carole Jones.

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



19. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

20. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

**Decision Sheet**

**Duration of meeting:** 10.00 am - 3.02 pm

**Chairman**

.....