

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 4 SEPTEMBER 2024

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

Apologies: Cllrs Hannah Hobbs-Chell

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

Elizabeth Adams (Development Management Team Leader), Kim Cowell (Development Management Area Manager (East)), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer) and Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer).

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests made at the meeting.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 31st July were confirmed and signed.

4. 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.

5. Planning Applications

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

6. P/FUL/2023/00864 - Blue Waters and Lichen Haven, Glebe Estate, Studland, Swanage, BH19 3AS

Members were provided with the following update:

- The officer's recommendation had been altered to reflect the need for affordable housing contributions in line with policy H11.
- Additional condition 19. There shall be no external lighting of the residential plots unless details have first been submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the character of the intrinsically dark Dorset National Landscape.

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 officer referred to concerns raised by the previous Local Ward member, Parish Council and third-party objectors in regard to a lack of infrastructure and over development of the site. In addition to this, members were provided with details of the site history, including pre application advice and were shown photographs of views looking towards the site, illustrative street scenes and proposed block and floor plans. Members were informed that the proposed design was similar to the pre application and would provide modern accommodation, garages and pools whilst being setback into the hillside to reduce height increases. The Case Officer advised members that a Landscape Visual Assessment had been carried out.

The officer also explained the proposed building materials, highlighting the inclusion of timber screens and anti-reflective glass to prevent overlooking and light spill. The distances between each dwelling were considered to be acceptable and the sustainability statement advised that ground floor heat pumps would be installed as an appropriate alternative to solar panels. The principle of the development was considered to be acceptable as the site was within the settlement boundary. The layout, scale, design, impact on character and appearance of area and the Dorset National Landscape was also considered to be acceptable. Therefore, the officer's recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions set out in the officer's report and an additional condition 19 and either:

- The completion of aS106 planning obligation to secure the Affordable Housing contribution in accordance with policy H11 of the Development plan,

OR

- The applicant providing full justification of particular circumstances that prevent the provision of affordable housing on the site and the viability assessment is verified by an independent person appointed by the Council in accordance with policy H11 of the Purbeck Local Plan 2024.

Public Participation

The planning agent for the applicant, Mr Davies, welcomed the officer recommendation and highlighted that the existing site had little architectural merit and needed work to be completed in order for the buildings to meet building standards. The agent explained the history of the site and the rationale behind the combined plots. The proposed dwellings had been carefully and sensitively designed by a local architect with a mixture of styles and materials to respect the local character of the area. Mr Davies reiterated that the proposal was within the settlement boundary and the separation distances fitted comfortably within the

area. Individual amenity space and parking had been included. He hoped the committee would support the officer recommendation and grant planning permission.

Members questions and comments

- Councillor Trite sought clarification of the previous Local Ward member's comments.
- Clarification regarding viability of affordable housing.
- Councillor Flower raised concern regarding applications returning to committee with a change to viability and reductions to affordable housing delivery. Councillor Flower has concerns regarding viability issues being determined by officers and changes to planning obligations being made under the scheme of delegation. The presenting officer clarified the requirements of policy H11 of the Development Plan and the Council's legal advisor explained paragraph 151 of the constitution.
- Members requested further information regarding the pools.
- Questions regarding the element of the link with Almondsbury and the impacts that this would have had on existing neighbouring properties.
- Clarification regarding the location of the site within the Glebe Estate
- Thanked the officers for a comprehensive report and presentation.
- Questions regarding possibility of removing Permitted Development Rights to prevent future development impacting neighbouring properties.
- Limitations of screening height.
- Concerns of residents and the architectural design of the proposals were acknowledged
- Points of clarification regarding parking arrangements.
- Cllr Trite felt that the proposal was inappropriate in terms of scale and design and would have set a precedence for future development. He felt that the views of the Parish former ward councillor and residents had been disregarded,
- Concerns were raised that viability should be considered as part of the officer assessment, not left to post committee
- Cllr Skeats proposed to approve the proposal on the grounds that the Permitted Development Right would have been removed. There was no seconder, therefore, the motion fell.
- Cllr Coombs proposed to grant the officer's recommendation but with the additional condition that if there was a viability challenge that it would return to committee.
- Cllr Flower felt that viability should have been considered at the point of determining the application.

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 with additional condition 19 and the planning obligation subject to the proviso that if there was a viability challenge then the application would return to committee, was proposed by Cllr Toni Coombs, and seconded by Cllr Alex Brenton.

Decision: To grant the officer's updated recommendation for approval subject to conditions set out in the officer's report, additional condition 19 and the additional requirement that if there was a viability challenge that it would return to committee. And to refuse the application if the affordable housing contribution or viability justification was provided in 6 months or longer period agreed by the Head of Planning.

7. **P/HOU/2023/06781 - 11A Bestwall Road, Wareham, BH20 4HY**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site within the settlement boundary of Wareham and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. Photographs of the proposed elevations, floor and site plans were shown with the addition of views from the street scenes. Members were provided with details of the officer pre-application advice and were informed that the proposal before them had been amended. The Case Officer highlighted the objections which had been raised by Wareham Town Council and third parties, noting comments that the asymmetric design was not in keeping with the area and if granted, would have set a precedence for overdevelopment.

The officer discussed the impacts on neighbouring amenity, referring to the assessment of impacts set out in the agenda report. The proposal would be visible from footpaths to the north and neighbouring allotment gardens; however, it was not considered that the changes would have any detrimental impacts nor warrant a reason for refusal. It created a modest design and included the proposal to erect a boundary fence to provide screening. The dormer window which would be evident for neighbouring properties, but no significant harm from overshadowing or overbearing impact had been identified. To support mitigation of overlooking neighbouring properties, members were referred to condition 5 in which obscure glazed windows were proposed. The Case Officer noted the need for conditioning the balcony screen and updated members on additional condition 8 which referred to the boundary fence.

The officer's presentation included images of the existing parking arrangements. Members were informed that included in the proposal was to replace the existing sloped drive with level parking which would allow two off street parking spaces. The Highways Authority did not identify any harm to highway safety, and it was deemed acceptable. The officer's recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions including:

8. Prior to the first use of the ground floor extensions hereby approved, a close board boundary fence to increase the overall height of boundary enclosure on the western boundary to 2m, from the point adjacent to the front elevation of no. 11A to the rear boundary, shall be erected and thereafter maintained.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity.

9. Within 1 month of garage being blocked up, the parking spaces shall be constructed and made available in accordance with plan 22150-00-17. Thereafter,

these areas must be permanently maintained; kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site in the interest of highway safety.

Public Participation

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposal. He did not accept the planning officer's report and felt as though they had ignored the reality of the site. Mr Farrant felt that if granted, the development would be severally intrusive to his neighbouring property and would not have been in keeping with the character of the area, nor would it reflect the street scene. Therefore, he urged the committee to overturn the officer recommendation and refuse planning permission.

Members questions and comments

- Questions regarding whether the proposal was one of or the narrowest plots in the road.
- The road had evolved with several houses undergone alterations.
- Clarification regarding the age of the property and those surrounding it. It was established that the existing dwelling was built in the 1970s
- Concerns regarding the overlooking of neighbours and the close proximity of the boundary wall. Cllr Ezzard felt that the proposal was an overdevelopment and spoil the street scene.
- Queries regarding noise impacts from the balcony.
- Queries regarding the National Landscape.
- Clarification whether the balcony had been enclosed to prevent overlooking and whether it would benefit form a natural light source.
- Clarification as to whether the existing footprint had been doubled.
- Members noted the changes in building standards since the proposal was first built.
- Cllr Sowry-House felt that the existing property design was not typical for the road and was mindful of families looking to improve existing dwellings due to difficulty in moving. The proposal would improve the amenity of housing within the area. He was pleased to see that the dormer windows had been set back and felt that the applicant had done their best to keep the eaves height consistent.
- Members were mindful of the overbearing impacts on neighbouring properties; however, it was noted that the character of the area was ever changing and were pleased that officers had worked hard to mitigate the impacts.

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 as well as additional conditions 8 and 9, was proposed by Cllr Duncan Sowry-House, and seconded by Cllr David Morgan.

Decision: To grant the officer's recommendation for approval subject to conditions set out in the officer's report as well as additional conditions 8 and 9.

Cllr Beryl Ezzard left the room and gave her apologies for the rest of the meeting.

8. **P/HOU/2024/00735 - Hawthorne, 5 The Green, Bloxworth, Wareham, BH20 7EX**

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, extant approval and proposed elevations were shown. Images from within the plot as well as views looking towards the proposal from neighbouring properties were included. Members were informed of the proposed building materials, noting wood cladding on the frontage and resin bonding gravel to replace the soft landscape at the front. Officer's felt that the modest front garden made a limited contribution to the character of the area and therefore the proposal could be accommodated and integrated into the street scene. Impacts regarding neighbouring amenity were explained, particular detail was given to parking was as officers had identified that there was only one viable parking space due to the need to retain access to the neighbouring drive. The highways team did not have any objections regarding highway safety, but the proposal was contrary to policy I2 of the Purbeck Local Plan which required adequate parking to be provided. The officer advised that notwithstanding the policy position, having regard to the fall back provided by the extant position which could have still been implemented, she was unable to recommend refusal on the grounds of loss of amenity and insufficient parking provision.

Images of the site showed an attractive cottage character. There was no flood risk identified, and a noise assessment had been carried out which identified that the air conditioning unit would not have impacted neighbouring amenity. The officer recommendation was to grant subject to conditions.

Public Participation

Mr Heaton, a neighbour, spoke in objection to the proposal. He felt that the application was flawed as it was a 5-bedroom home with only one parking space. He considered that the proposal failed to meet parking standards and if approved it would create a dysfunctional access to the property. Mr Heaton didn't object to the building; however, he highlighted the garages should be converted without alternative parking provision. He felt that the fence next to the site could have been inset to allow for additional parking. One space was not acceptable, it would have constricted access. The proposal should meet parking requirements and without sufficient parking, he felt that the proposal should be refused.

Mr Vincent, a neighbour, spoke in support of the proposal. He explained to members that he had lived on The Green for over 19 years. He explained that the existing garages were too small, and cars had been parking outside. Mr Vincent highlighted flooding and raised concerns regarding comments raised by the Parish meeting which he believed were based on one person's opinion and not

representative. He hoped the committee would support the officer recommendation.

The agent addressed the committee and explained the alterations. Mr Carter also raised concerns about the parish meeting's objection, stating that the application had only been briefly raised at the Parish meeting. He confirmed that permeable materials were proposed for the front garden, the use would not change, nor would it impact flooding. The agent noted that parking was proven to be acceptable, and the applicants had always parked the way proposed. Due to the existing garage having not met existing size standards, there was no loss of parking. The principle of development was acceptable and there were no objections from highways. Therefore, the agent hoped members would support the officer recommendation.

Members questions and comments

- Reassurance regarding Parish meeting's comments and from consultees.
- Clarification whether the aco drain would have led to a soakaway or surface water drain.
- Location of air conditioning units and whether acoustic fencing had been considered to mitigate noise impacts.
- Comments regarding the committee being in a difficult position due to the extant permission. Members sought clarification as to what could potentially happen in an appeal situation and the issues regarding fallback.
- Queries as to what would have happened if the committee were minded refusing permission.
- Confirmation regarding alternative parking in the locality.
- Cllr Sowry-House felt that the parking was inadequate, and the proposal would change the character of the development. He did not feel it was a good design as it relied on remote parking contrary to policies I2 and E12.

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 Duncan Sowry-House, and seconded by Cllr Alex Brenton as o the proposed development provided inadequate parking provision as required by policy I2 (Improving accessibility and transport) of the Purbeck Local Plan 2018-2034 (adopted 2024). The proposal would increase pressure for parking elsewhere within the settlement and therefore did not represent good design contrary to policy E12 (Design) of the Purbeck Local Plan 2018-2034 (adopted 2024) and Chapter 12, in particular paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

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

9. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

10. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 12.41 pm

Chairman

.....