

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 30 APRIL 2025

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

Apologies: Cllrs Spencer Flower and Andy Skeats

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

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

76. Declarations of Interest

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

77. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 02 April 2025 were confirmed and signed.

78. 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.

79. P/FUL/2024/06189 - Hope Farm Mill Street Corfe Mullen BH21 3RQ

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Senior Planning Officer identified the site and explained the proposal. The barn and building to be retained were identified on a site plan and aerial photograph. Photographs of the site, access and nearby road were also shown to members.

The planning history of the site was explained and included a previous application that had been refused, for the conversion of the existing building into rural worker's accommodation.

Officers considered that the proposal was compliant with planning policy, as the mobile home and storage shed would have minimal impact on the Green Belt due to their modest size and the mixed use would be in keeping with the rural

character of the area. A rural worker's dwelling was considered appropriate due to the high level of care required for the livestock.

It was explained that the Town Council had objected to the application on the grounds of the impact on heritage assets, due to the proximity to St Hubert's Church, however the Conservation Officer had not raised objection to the proposal.

Public representation was received from the applicant, Mr Cooper, who explained that the farm provided community benefits, such as working with children and adults with additional needs and providing training for students working towards agricultural qualifications.

The meeting adjourned at 10:24 – 10:25 to allow the case officer to clarify information before answering member's questions.

In response to questions from members the Senior Planning Officer provided the following responses:

- The alpaca treks didn't cross public roads and went onto the old railway line adjacent to the site.
- Husbandry of the alpacas required intensive care which justified the use of a worker's dwelling, temporary permission was being recommended which would require a new application after 3 years.
- It was not known whether the applicant had explicit permission from the landowner to use the old railway line for treks.
- Mobile homes do not have the same permitted development rights as other residential dwellings.
- The Historic Landscape Character Area data on Dorset Explorer was not considered to be a material planning consideration.
- The permission for the ancillary residential buildings was also recommended to be temporary.
- Parts of the application site was subject to surface water flooding, however not where the buildings were proposed and ground water flooding was proven to be low risk.
- The use of the site for agricultural usage was lawful and would not require planning permission and a condition on livestock density couldn't be reasonably imposed.

Having had the opportunity to ask questions of the case officer and debate the merits of the application, several members raised questions about the application, including the exterior cladding which they considered to give the structure a more permanent appearance, the legal use of the trail for trekking and whether the worker's dwelling could be occupied by a widow or retired worker for longer than the 3 year temporary permission. Members considered that they required further information on these points in order to make an informed decision on the application.

It was proposed by Cllr Coombs and seconded by Cllr Sowry-House to defer the application until a later meeting.

Decision: That the application be deferred until a later meeting.

80. **P/FUL/2024/05059 - 50 Churchill Close Sturminster Marshall BH21 4BH**

The Development Management Team Leader presented the application for the demolition of a garage and outbuilding and the erection of 2 bungalows with parking.

The site was outlined on a map of the area. It was explained that the special character of the 1950s estate, with dwellings set around the open space, was recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan. Attention was drawn to back land dwellings on Churchill Close, with similarity to the proposal, that had been granted at appeal prior to the adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan and to bungalows to the north of Churchill Close.

The site plan was shown to members and the location of the outbuilding and garage, which were set to be removed were identified. The proposed floor plans and elevations of the two new bungalows were provided and it was explained that due to the back land position, the single storey design was judged to be in keeping as it would not compromise the character of the estate.

The key constraints of the application site were summarised. Officers considered that the pitched roofs would prevent an adverse impact on neighbour amenity and the location of the new bungalows would be typical of the existing dwellings in the area. Oblique overlooking from a neighbouring first floor bedroom window would not demonstrably harm amenity for future occupiers. There was not considered to be any parking or highway safety issues arising, ground water flood risk had been discounted and a surface water management plan had been provided including use of a soakaway.

Public representation was received in objection to the application from Mr Eaton, Mr Weaver and Cllr Palmer. They stated that the new properties would have a negative impact on the character of the area contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan and harm to neighbouring amenity by causing excess noise pollution and obstructing views from the neighbouring properties. They also raised concerns about the impact the properties would have on local flooding issues, by increasing the areas of hardstanding and the wildlife impact.

Mr Miell, spoke in support of the application as the agent, he stated that the character and appearance of the bungalows would be in keeping with the area and that they would be screened from the street scene by the existing properties.

In response to the public speakers the Development Management Team Leader clarified that the hard surfacing would be permeable to mitigate against flooding and officers did not consider any overlooking to be harmful to the neighbouring properties.

The Development Management Team Leader provided the following responses to members questions:

- There was fencing and hedging in place to provide screening between plots, additional planting may be achieved however this wasn't considered necessary to make the application acceptable.

- Due to the size of the land affected by the application and its use as garden, an Ecological Impact Assessment was not required under the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol, but a condition could be added to require a reptile survey if judged necessary by Members on the basis of the neighbour's concerns.
- Officers considered that the development would not detract from the character of the area, as the bungalows would be set back and be of a low profile.
- There would be a separate area for bin storage, so it would not contribute to clutter on the street.
- Officers didn't consider there to be a significant loss of light to neighbouring properties, due to the dwellings being single storey and having pitched roofs.

Having had the opportunity to debate the merits of the application several concerns were raised by members; these included an impact of harm to neighbour amenity arising from overlooking and noise due to the proximity of the bungalows to the neighbouring properties at the rear and an adverse impact on the area due to overdevelopment. It was also raised that there would be a detrimental impact on the outlook of the existing properties.

It was proposed by Cllr Goringe and seconded by Cllr Ezzard to grant the application with an additional condition to ensure a slow worm survey be carried out. Upon being put to a vote the motion fell.

It was proposed by Cllr Coombs and seconded by Cllr Trite to refuse the application.

The meeting adjourned to allow officers to draft the wording for the reasons for refusal. 12:35 – 12:44

Decision: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the appendix to these minutes.

81. P/HOU/2025/00586 - 15 High Street Winfrith Newburgh DT2 8JW

The committee agreed to extend the meeting beyond three hours.

The meeting adjourned 12:48 – 12:59

The Development Management Team Leader presented the application, for the erection of a single storey rear extension, which had been objected to by the Parish Council.

The location of the application site was identified on a map of the area and photographs of the dwelling were shown from various viewpoints. The site consisted of a single bedroom Grade II listed cottage with a single storey rear extension and the proposal was to erect an additional rear extension to create a larger living area. It was explained that the Parish Council had objected on the grounds that it would be an inappropriate development.

The elevations and plans of the proposed extension were shown to members and it was explained that the Conservation Officer had not raised any objection to the proposal. Officers considered that the benefits of the application, which would secure a viable use by providing modern living accommodation, outweighed the

less than substantial harm of the loss of historic fabric and noted that listed building consent had already been granted.

The Parish Council had also objected to the application on the grounds of loss of light to the neighbouring property, however officers considered that the modest eaves height and sunken ground level would mitigate against significant loss of light. The retention of off-street parking and intention to manage surface water was also noted.

Having had the chance to debate the merits of the application members were in agreement that the proposal would offer benefits in modernising the accommodation of a traditional cottage.

It was proposed by Cllr Brenton and seconded by Cllr Sowry-House that the application be granted.

Decision: That the application be granted subject to conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

82. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

83. Exempt Business

There was no exempt business.

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 1.13 pm

Chairman

.....