

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 3 SEPTEMBER 2024

Present: Cllrs Richard Crabb (Chair), Barrie Cooper, Jack Jeanes, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Pothecary, Belinda Ridout, James Vitali and Carl Woode

Apologies: Cllrs David Taylor and Les Fry

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

Steven Banks (Planning Officer), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), Hannah Massey (Lawyer - Regulatory), Alex Skidmore (Lead Project Officer), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)), Alister Trendell (Project Engineer) and Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer).

3. Declarations of Interest

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

4. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 16th July were confirmed and signed.

5. 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.

6. Planning Applications

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

7. P/FUL/2024/01509 - The Stables, Long Mead, Melway Lane, Child Okeford, Blandford Forum, DT11 8EW

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 block plans and elevations were shown as the Case Officer highlighted that the proposal had been sensitively designed. Details of the proposed high-quality materials such as slate and timber cladding were also provided which had been chosen to be in keeping for the rural location. The officer's presentation referred to condition 7 when setting out the

principle of the development, whilst providing details of the proposed outbuilding which would have provided incidental use to the main dwelling such as dry storage of vehicles, garden equipment and other domestic storage.

The Case Officer discussed the impacts on local amenities, noting the nearest neighbouring property was 98 metres north, a significant distance and the proposal was situated within a well screened area by mature trees and hedgerows which may have been partially visible from some nearby Rights of Way. There were no visual or landscape impacts, biodiversity enhancements would have been carried out on site in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Scheme. There was no flood risk, and the Case Officer highlighted that the access would have remained as approved and there were no demonstrable risks to highways safety.

The Case Officer noted that Child Okeford Parish Council had objected to the proposed development on the basis that a condition was imposed on the planning permission for the associated dwelling that removed permitted development rights. The Case Officer explained that this condition was not imposed with the intention of placing an absolute prohibition on further development on the site falling under permitted development rights but to ensure that any such proposed development was subject to scrutiny given the sensitive location of the site.

The officer's recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Mr S Graeser spoke on behalf of the applicant, highlighting that the primary attraction for the proposal was for off grid living. He discussed the use of solar equipment and that the scale and size of the proposal was appropriate. The agent highlighted that there had been a reduction in the height and that the floor level would have been the same as the existing dwelling which was lower than the previous stable building. The proposal received no objections from Highways Officers and a Tree Protection Order had been included to protect the longevity of the oak tree on site. In addition to this, the agent's representation also highlighted that the proposal would not have created any additional noise and nor would it impact on the character or appearance of the area. There were no material considerations to warrant refusal and Mr S Graeser hoped members would endorse the officer recommendation.

Cllr B Ireland made a representation on behalf of Child Okeford Parish Council. She highlighted the history of the site, noting that permission had previously been granted due to lack of housing supply and the titled balance argument. She felt that the proposal conflicted with several policies which would have impacted the character of the area and would have been detrimental to the impacts on the AONB. Child Okeford Parish Council didn't feel as though garages or sheds were permitted on site and were concerned that if approved it would have further intensified domestic development. Cllr B Ireland considered public views and urged the committee to refuse the application.

Members questions and comments

- Questions regarding screening and impacts on visibility during winter months.
- Confirmation as to whether the proposal was an intensification of the site.
- Clarification regarding reimposing Permitted Development Rights.
- Clarity regarding original planning documentation and conditions.
- Members discussed the removal and intention of removing permitted development rights when the previous committee considered the application in May 2023.
- The proposal was outside the settlement boundary and was close to the AONB. There had been no change or justification regarding the removal of Permitted Development Rights.
- Members noted that the existing stable block was higher than the proposed building, therefore it would've been less visually intrusive.
- Members felt that the applicant had taken on board officer comments and had created a proportionate 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 Belinda Ridout, and seconded by Cllr Carole Jones.

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

8. P/VOC/2024/03162 - 2A Mill Lane, Charminster, DT2 9QP

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 approved and proposed elevations, block plans, views from footpaths and site photographs, in particular the existing front elevation and slate roof of the neighbouring Coach House were shown. Details regarding the site location and constraints were highlighted. The Case Officer provided members with a description of the proposed variations which included a change to the roof material from concrete pantiles as existing to grey slate. As well as altering the external wall finishing on the southwest and northwest elevations from brick as existing to cream or white render. The proposal was to also alter the approved dormer roof material from zinc to grey single ply membrane. To demonstrate a visual representation, images of local examples from Mill Lane were provided. The officer's recommendation was to grant planning permission, subject to 2.73 commencement and plan number conditions.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding objections raised from the neighbouring property and the impacts on front dormer.
- Members felt that the proposal was reasonable and sensible.

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 James Vitali.

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

9. **P/VOC/2024/01076 - Frogmore Lane, Sixpenny Handley, Dorset, SP5 5NY**

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 elevations, indicative street scenes and site photographs were shown. Members were given details of the drainage strategy and were provided with a ground coverage comparison of a previously approved scheme with current scheme. The Case Officer informed members that the proposal was situated on an allocated site which was previously granted and complied with policy. Reference was made to policy CHASE7, part e; the implementation of a sustainable drainage solution that protects features and species of nature conservation interest, protects housing on the site from flooding and ensures that there is no increased risk of flooding to other land or buildings. The location was considered to be sustainable, and the proposal was acceptable in its design and general visual impact and there would not have been any significant harm to the landscape character of the AONB or on neighbouring residential amenity. The officer's recommendation was to grant subject to conditions.

Public Participation

Mr McLean made a public objection as a neighbour who lived adjacent to the site. In his representation, he discussed the differentiation between surface and groundwater flooding as well as the impacts on the site. Mr McLean also discussed roadways and highlighted the history of the site. Noting that it had previously been refused due to flooding. He felt that the proposal contradicted advice which had previously been and urged members to refuse.

The agent thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak in support of the proposal. He noted that the proposed amendments resulted in a potential increase which varied across the units. There had been no change regarding the boundary treatments or impacts to neighbouring properties. Mr Moir also highlighted the surface water strategy and noted that there had been no objections raised by the

flood authority. The proposal accorded with the NPPF and Local Plan, if approved it would not have caused harm to the character and appearance of area. He hoped the committee would support the officer's recommendation.

Cllr Mereweather strongly challenged the officer's recommendation. He did not feel as though the proposal complied with national policies and highlighted the distinction between ground water and surface water flooding. Cllr Mereweather informed the committee that a report had been commissioned from groundwater specialists and the results had been shared with the case officer and applicant. Identifying that there was a very high risk for the two properties. He did not feel as though the case officer acknowledged the reality of ground water flooding and that the NPPF guidance on managing flooding had been ignored, specifically paragraphs 116, 177 and 159 where it commented on an increase flood risk. Cllr Mereweather urged the committee to refuse or condition the proposal appropriately.

The Local Ward member reiterated the comments raised by concerned residents. Cllr P Brown highlighted the differences between ground water and surface water flooding, he felt that the application was dangerous and increased risk. The Local Ward member noted the applicant's solution however he was concerned regarding the increase in surface water run off outside the development. Therefore, he encouraged the committee to consider the interest of existing and future residents. He urged the committee to turn down the proposal.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding the drainage strategy and prevention of flooding on the development.
- Concerns regarding flood risk increase.
- Questions regarding how members could have been assured that the varied conditioned wouldn't have increased flood risk.
- Clarification that officers were satisfied with the hydrological assessments.
- Members felt that they had a responsibility for local residents and asked for assurance that both ground and surface water flooding had been considered.
- Questions regarding whether the redundancy in the drainage scheme would have been impacted.
- Following questions and the debate, members noted that. There were no planning grounds to warrant refusal.

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 Sherry Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Belinda Ridout.

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

10. **WD/D/20/003259 - Land North of Wanchard Lane, Charminster**

The Case Officer provided members with the following update:

- Due to the reduction in the number of affordable housing units on the site, it had resulted in a reduction in the financial contributions.

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 noting that the location had been altered from the first submission and there had been a reduction in scale due to the view in and out of the site. Photographs of the proposed floor plans, elevations and illustrative Landscape Plans were shown, as well as photographs of the site which identified the principal view of the proposal from the village. The presentation also included details of the site being situated on a gradient and identified the issues regarding this, the proposed pedestrian access as well as identifying affordable housing units. The Case Officer identified the conservation area and the AONB, highlighting an open area within the site and strategic planting which would've created a buffer. Members were provided with details of the proposed local materials and the officer presentation identified the nearby neighbouring property and discussed the impacts. The officer's recommendation was to grant subject to conditions and S106 obligations set out in the report.

Public Participation

Mr Hoskinson made a representation, informing the members that he was the planning director for Wyatt Homes. He was proud of the high quality and well-designed homes as well as the inclusion of community halls, allotments and highways improvements. Noting that it had been sensitively designed to protect the setting and be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Mr Hoskinson highlighted that if approved, phase 4 would have contributed to the housing land supply as well as the creation for local employment. In his representation, he highlighted the highway improvements of the scheme which would have aimed to reduce traffic movements and that the proposed new homes would have been energy and water efficient. Mr Hoskinson hoped members would support the officer recommendation.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification regarding the number of visitor and communal parking spaces.
- Confirmation as to whether the other phases of the development are within the conservation area.
- Members were pleased that the affordable housing was policy compliant, however, concerns were raised regarding the location of them.
- Clarification regarding access to the site and through routes.
- Clarification regarding visibility splays and the safety improvements of the revised junction.

- Members sought confirmation that the link roads would have been adopted by the highway's authority.
- Members felt that the proposal was a well thought out design which was well screened and were pleased with the quality and inclusion of affordable housing. In addition to this, they also felt that the materials had been well chosen and thought out to be in keeping with the character 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 Belinda Ridout, and seconded by Cllr Rory Major.

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.

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

The Case Officer informed members that the application was unchanged from when it was presented at the previous committee meeting which was held on Tuesday 16th July 2024. However, there was a new condition regarding nutrient neutrality proposed due to the recent change in approach in the Poole Harbour Catchment.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Clarification as to why the permitted development rights were being removed.

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 Jack Jeanes.

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

12. **P/OUT/2023/01413 - Land between Linden House and Rose Cottage, Wavering Lane West Gillingham, SP8 4NR**

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 indicative site plan, images looking towards and within the site which identified the boundary were shown. Details of the existing site survey, proposed access and National Cycle and Footpath networks were provided. Members were also informed that the proposal was outside of the settlement boundary and the presentation included details of the principle of development, specifically living conditions, character and appearance as well as highways safety. The Case Officer also discussed Tree Protection Orders and biodiversity impacts. The officer's recommendation was to delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Service Manager for development management and enforcement to grant subject to conditions.

Cllr James Vitali left the room and gave his apologies for the rest of the meeting.

Public Participation

Mr Robinson spoke in objection to the proposal. He highlighted that the proposal was outside the settlement boundary and did not feel as though a need for the proposal had been demonstrated and would set a precedent for further parts of the site in which it was situated. Mr Robinson referred to 5.2 of the planning statement and highlighted that the proposal was rebuilt on original footprint. It would have been an overdevelopment which would've had adverse impacts on living conditions. In summary, residents did not feel as though it complied with local polices and was overbearing and intrusive. Mr Robinson urged members of the committee to refuse the officers recommendation.

Mr Williams thanked the officer for his comprehensive report and presentation. He explained that only access was to be approved at this stage. The agent highlighted that the proposal was within a sustainable location, the layout was illustrative, and it was not evidenced that it would have increased flooding. Mr Williams noted that each case should be considered on its own merit and as there were no adverse impacts, permission should have been granted as recommended.

Members questions and comments

- Members noted the history of the site and the previous reasons for refusal, they queried what material planning reasons had changed to warrant approval.
- Confirmation regarding site access.
- Clarification regarding the published Housing Land Supply figures.
- The proposal was outside the settlement boundary and there were no evidenced exceptional circumstances. In addition to this, the proposal was against the NPPF and neighbourhood plan.
- Members did not support the proposal before them and discussed grounds for refusal based on the proposal being situated on a greenfield site outside the settlement boundary of Gillingham nor did it meet the local housing needs.

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 Sherry Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Val Potheary due to the site which lied on a greenfield site outside the settlement boundary for Gillingham. The site wasn't allocated for housing development in either the adopted Local Plan or more recent Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed development would not have met local identified housing needs, nor represent a type of development that would have been appropriate in the countryside, or otherwise have a demonstrable overriding need for a countryside location. The development of the site would have therefore represented an unsustainable form of development, contrary to the spatial strategy of the adopted development plan, specifically Policies 2, 6 and 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 2016. It would also conflict the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.

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

13. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

14. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 1.12 pm

Chairman

.....