

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 4 JUNE 2025

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

Apologies: Cllrs Hannah Hobbs-Chell

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

Elizabeth Adams (Development Management Team Leader), Kelly Allingham (Planning Officer), Marianne Ashworth (Lawyer - Regulatory), James Brightman (Senior Planning Officer), Kim Cowell (Development Management Area Manager (East)), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), John Miles (Democratic Services Officer) and Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

1. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Duncan Sowry-House declared an interest to agenda item 6, in which he had declared that he was the Local Ward Member and had been in discussion with residents. Therefore, it was agreed that he would not take part in the debate or vote but would speak as the Local Ward Member.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 30th April 2025 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. P/FUL/2024/06284 - 47 Woolsbridge Road St Leonards and St Ives BH24 2LT

The Case Officer used plans and aerial photographs to identify the site and explained the proposal, relevant planning policies, and site context. The proposed dwellings featured traditional design elements including brick walls, tiled roofs, inset windows, and chimney detailing. Visuals demonstrated that the design aligned with the surrounding street scene. The principle of development was

considered acceptable. The scale, design, and spacing were appropriate and caused no harm to local character. The proposal complied with the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan (CED) Policy LN2 by achieving suitable density and providing adequate internal and external amenity space in accordance with national standards. Separation distances, including 24m to the northwest, were deemed sufficient. Obscure glazing, which was included in Conditions 12 & 13, were also proposed to mitigate overlooking. The landscaping condition was amended to include a requirement to erect 1.8m high close-boarded fencing on the site's boundary with 45 Woolsbridge road.

Flood risk was assessed as low based on site-specific groundwater monitoring. A surface water management strategy was proposed and accepted by the Council's drainage engineers, meeting the requirements of CED Policy ME6 and Section 14 of the NPPF. Nine on-site parking spaces were provided, and any additional on-street parking would serve as traffic calming. No protected trees were present, and the scheme maintained an appropriate relationship with surrounding vegetation, in line with CED Policy HE2. The ecological impact on Dorset Heathlands and the New Forest Special Conservation Area was acknowledged and the officer recommendation relied on completion a planning obligation in this respect. The proposal also addressed identified national and local housing needs.

Public Participation

Roy Burgess objected to the proposal, citing the Parish Council's concerns about overdevelopment in an area largely comprised of bungalows. He raised concerns about garages positioned near the boundary, the need for boundary screening and the potential impact of construction on roots of existing cherry and laurel trees growing close to the site boundary. While not opposed to development of the plot, he considered a bungalow more appropriate and suggested modifications were needed.

Giles Moir, on behalf of Ashley Limited, thanked the Committee and noted close collaboration with Case Officers, including pre-application advice. He highlighted the site's urban location and the contribution the proposal would make toward Dorset's housing need, particularly for family homes. The agent emphasised the scheme's quick delivery, quality chalet-style design, adequate separation distances, and off-street parking. He acknowledged the proposed obscure glazing condition and noted no objections apart from the Parish Council. He expressed hope for the Committee's support.

Members questions and comments

- Members emphasised the importance of protecting tree and hedge roots during construction and requested an informative note to ensure appropriate measures were taken
- Clarification was sought on the dimensions of the proposed garages.
- Members thanked the Case Officer for a comprehensive report, noting the site had remained vacant and neglected for several years. They welcomed the revised scheme proposing three dwellings, which were considered to complement the properties opposite.
- Additional planning conditions were requested by way of an amendment to the existing landscaping condition to secure hard landscaping details and provision for fencing.

- Although there was no mandatory requirement for sustainability features, members expressed disappointment at the absence of solar panels and considered it a missed opportunity.
- Clarification was requested regarding the location and size of windows with obscure glazing. Cllr Coombs noted that no floor plan had been provided and raised concerns about a secondary window not providing adequate outlook. The information did not alleviate their unease.
- Members shared concerns previously raised, particularly regarding the lack of sustainable materials and the constraints of plot 2. Garage sizes were also raised as a concern.
- The need for sustainable development was highlighted. Members referenced the goal of achieving net zero and expressed the view that future policies, including a revised Local Plan under the new administration, should mandate the inclusion of sustainable materials such as solar panels.

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 as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Barry Goringe, and seconded by Cllr Spencer Flower, subject to conditions set out in the officer report and additional landscaping conditions and tree/shrub root protection during construction.

Decision: GRANT, subject to receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement to provide the necessary mitigation for the proposal's impact on the New Forest National Park Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation, Site of Special Scientific Interest & Ramsar site and the conditions as set out at the end of the report. As well as an amendment to landscaping condition 7 and an Informative note regarding root protection during construction.

or

B) REFUSE permission for the reason set out within the report if the agreement is not completed by 4 December 2025 (6 months from the date of committee) or such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning.

5. **P/FUL/2024/04192 - 113 Wimborne Road Corfe Mullen BH21 3DU**

The Case Officer, using a visual presentation with plans and aerial photographs, identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies. It was noted that tree felling, and site clearance had occurred prior to the application; while the trees were not protected, they contributed to the character of the area. Pre-application advice had been sought, during which officers confirmed the principle of development was acceptable, though three-bedroom units were encouraged to meet need identified by the strategic housing market assessment (SHMA).

The submitted site plan considered objections from the Town Council and residents. It included a robust planting scheme with established trees to provide a transitional buffer between rural and developed land. While the Town Council identified a need for two-three-bedroom homes, the generous unit sizes and site context justified a departure from that guidance. Proposed materials and finishes were detailed, with finished floor levels and ridge heights slightly higher than existing dwellings. A site section demonstrated the relationship between Unit 4 and Candy's Close, showing a similar design and roof profile to avoid any overbearing impact. No loss of sunlight was identified.

A separation of approximately 10m between existing and proposed dwellings was confirmed, supported by photographic evidence. Landscaping and boundary fencing formed a key part of the scheme. Existing floor plans and elevations of 113 Wimborne Road were presented. The Highways Team raised no concerns, noting the inclusion of a raised traffic calming platform and reliance on garage and driveway parking, with additional visitor spaces provided. The site was considered sustainably located within the settlement boundary. No significant harm was identified, and the recommendation was for approval, subject to conditions.

Public Participation

Ben Bolton, a local resident, objected to the proposal, stating the ecological report incorrectly claimed the site clearance was undertaken by the previous owner, when it was carried out by the developers. He raised concerns over the lack of a rural survey and limited access to sustainable transport, noting few local amenities and a reliance on cars, particularly for elderly residents and families with young children. He described the access lane to Wimborne Road as narrow and unsafe, referencing two previous accidents. He also cited flood risk due to high groundwater levels. Finally, he criticised the way the site was cleared, noting trees were destroyed without warning or regard for nearby families, raising concerns about the developer's future conduct and lack of due diligence.

Jackie Bonham thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak. She described the site as a previously thriving habitat, which had been suddenly cleared, causing damage. She noted the presence of protected and priority species, including orchids and bats, and stated that actions taken had resulted in habitat loss. Ms. Bonham emphasised the need to prioritise 2- and 3-bedroom homes and stressed that new developments must respect the character of the area. She urged officers to enforce biodiversity net gain and expressed that developers should be held accountable for the loss of mature trees, which she described as more than mere scenery.

Julian Biles raised serious concerns for family safety, noting that pedestrian and vehicle movements would occur just feet from their home. He highlighted that the narrow access was inadequately addressed and questioned how wheelchair and pushchair users would safely navigate the area. He emphasised that what works for one household would not be sufficient for multiple dwellings and stated that parking provisions were inadequate. He concluded that the development posed a threat.

The agent Ken Parke spoke in support of the proposal, noting the large site was currently occupied by a single dwelling. He described the scheme as well-

designed, providing good-sized 2- and 3-bedroom houses with a sufficient layout that met policy requirements. Mr Parke acknowledged concerns about site clearance but confirmed no wrongdoing had occurred. He stated the proposal met biodiversity and highways requirements and highlighted that flood risk had been thoroughly assessed and was low. Development was expected to alleviate existing issues. He advised on energy efficiency and urged members to support the officer's recommendation.

Cllr Duncan Sowry-House urged refusal of the proposal, stating it failed to reflect the character of the area. He noted mature trees had been removed and referenced NPPF Section 16 on environmental protection. He highlighted the devastating impact of site clearance on protected species and argued that developments should enhance local character, which this proposal did not.

The Local Ward Member raised significant access and safety concerns, stating this contradicted policy. He also cited surface water flooding risks, noting flooding had already occurred. Cllr Sowry-House concluded that the proposal undermined both local and national policies and respectfully urged the Committee to refuse permission.

Members questions and comments

- Clarified no space existed as indicated in the report.
- Raised concerns about inadequate site access and poor visibility splays.
- Questioned whether the track width was sufficient for refuse and emergency vehicles.
- Noted absence of a waste condition; requested submission of a waste management plan.
- Acknowledged the density of the scheme was appropriate to the area's character.
- Cllr A Skeats Suggested consideration of a site visit.
- Presumed access track would remain a private drive; questioned whether Dorset Waste would collect from private drives.
- Raised concerns about compliance with building regulations.
- Noted several accidents had occurred on the existing road.
- Reported concerns from Parish Council, local ward member, and residents regarding biodiversity and access.
- Expressed no concerns over design but deemed access inadequate.
- Mentioned proximity of proposed access to another development's access near the site entrance and potential conflict by adding an additional driveway.
- Noted track length of 50 metres.
- Questioned whether density was calculated by number of dwellings per hectare or footprint, noting inconsistency with the area.
- Requested clarification on ownership of land containing hedging adjacent to access.
- Accepted officer's reasoning regarding overdevelopment

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 as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Spencer Flower, and seconded by Cllr Andy Skeats, subject to inadequate access.

Decision: To refuse planning permission due to the proposed access. Due to its narrow width for a substantial length, was inadequate for the quantum of development proposed, would fail to provide safe access for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists and may lead to conflict due to the presence of other accesses close to the site frontage. The development was therefore contrary to policies KS11 and HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan 2014 and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. **P/FUL/2024/05148 - Lonnen Nurseries Lonnen Road Colehill Wimborne BH21 7AZ**

The Case Officer, supported by a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies. The site was located within the Green Belt. The principle of development was considered acceptable under infill provisions and the site plan showed use of the existing access. Proposed elevations and separation distances demonstrated there would be no harmful overlooking, including from the proposed rear balcony, due to sufficient spacing. It was noted that the southern part of the site could be susceptible to high groundwater levels. The site was well-treed, and a 30-year biodiversity management plan was proposed to ensure appropriate enhancement and maintenance of biodiversity net gain. The location's sustainability was assessed with reference to Policy KS2. Although within the Green Belt, the site's proximity to the settlement and the current housing land supply position were considered. Officers concluded there were no grounds to warrant refusal.

Public Participation

Chris Miell a chartered town planner and former planning Inspector with over 10 years' experience, speaking as agent on the application addressed objections regarding flooding and Green Belt. He noted no public objections and described the proposal as modest infill development near Colehill, improving existing land use. The massing and design were consistent with the area and similar developments. He confirmed no flood risk and that a sequential test was unnecessary. He found no planning reasons to refuse and no conflict with the NPPF, urging the Committee to approve in line with officer recommendations.

Members questions and comments

- Sought clarification on whether outbuildings included garden sheds.
- Expressed support for the proposed ground treatment, woodland management plan, and inclusion of a pond, describing it as a sensible, self-contained approach.
- Noted that infilling in the Green Belt would complete the village.
- Referred to Condition 11 concerning the temporary caravan.
- Requested clarification on Condition 6 regarding cellular confinement.

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 as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Toni Coombs, and seconded by Cllr David Morgan, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

7. **P/FUL/2024/07471 - South Hyde, The Hyde, Langton Matravers, BH19 3HE**

The Case Officer, supported by plans and aerial photographs, identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies. The site was located just south of the defined settlement boundary and involved the replacement of a long-vacant dwelling. Access was via a private drive, with open fields to the south. The site was visible from several public rights of way, and the removal of trees had increased visibility of the existing structure. Two adjacent trees were noted on neighbouring land.

The site context plan and history of refused applications were presented, demonstrating how previous reasons for refusal had been addressed. The proposed site plan reflected pre-application advice and included a reduced footprint. Proposed elevations were compared with the previously refused scheme. Materials and the addition of rear-facing solar panels were highlighted. The Highway Engineer raised no objections, and no harm to residential amenity was identified. Drainage had been a key concern, and the officer outlined the measures taken to resolve this. The application was for a self-build dwelling. Biodiversity replacement measures had been secured through an ecological assessment.

Public Participation

Giles Moir stated the applicants were not commercial developers but building a family home. He noted refusal related to biodiversity details, not planning principle. Pre-application advice led to reduced scale and use of materials reflecting the area's character. He raised no objection, subject to conditions. Tree felling occurred before the applicants owned the site; the current scheme included new tree planting and solar panels. Surface water disposal and drainage were addressed. He concluded the proposal enhanced the area and provided a new home for the applicants.

Members questions and comments

- Noted the applicant had collaborated and sought professional advice, taking comments on board.
- Welcomed the inclusion of water butts in the proposal.
- Identified surface water as the only issue, but acknowledged the report was comprehensive.
- Commended planning officers for their efforts in producing a more suitable application.
- Referenced concerns previously raised by the Parish Council.

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 as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Andy Skeats, and seconded by Cllr Beryl Ezzard, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant subject to a s106, either Recommendation

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: (i) The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) self-build exemption and (ii) A payment of £4,826 as financial compensation for the loss of trees and scrub habitat on the site.

Or

B) REFUSE permission for the reasons set out within the report if the agreement was not completed by 4 February 2026 or such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning.

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

8. **P/HOU/2025/01603 - 46 West Street, Wareham, BH20 4JZ**

The Case Officer, using plans and aerial photographs, identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies. The site was located near the centre of Wareham. The proposal involved the erection of a single garage with access from the rear. Site photographs showed the relationship to an existing large garage on the neighbouring property. Existing and proposed plans were presented, noting that views were largely screened by a boundary wall, though the eastern elevation would be partially visible from New Road. The proposed garage was modest in scale, set back from the boundary, and not considered to cause harm to neighbouring amenity.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Noted no objections were received; site notices were posted.
- Confirmed no comments were received from the local ward member.
- Local ward member confirmed she had 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 as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Duncan Sowry-House, and seconded by Cllr Spencer Flower, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

9. **P/LBC/2025/01488 - East Dorset Heritage Trust Allendale House Hanham Road Wimborne Minster BH21 1AS**

The Case Officer, with the aid of plans and aerial photographs, identified the site and outlined the dual application and relevant planning policies. The site was accessed via Hanham Road and located within the Wimborne Conservation Area and is a Grade II listed building. No changes were proposed to existing parking arrangements. The proposal included the installation of two bollards opposite a turning circle to regulate access to a private car park for authorised users only, via a mobile app. Photographs were presented showing the car park and surrounding context. No objections were received. The application also proposed the rebuilding of a red brick boundary wall to the west of the site, forming part of the landscape boundary. Recycled bricks were to be used to match the existing character. Additional photographs illustrated the current condition and design context.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Raised issue regarding use of mobile phone app while driving.
- Noted matter related to a private highway.

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 as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Spencer Flower, and seconded by Cllr Toni Coombs, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant permission for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

10. **P/FUL/2025/01489 - East Dorset Heritage Trust Allendale House Hanham Road Wimborne Minster BH21 1AS**

The Case Officer, with the aid of plans and aerial photographs, identified the site and outlined the dual application and relevant planning policies. The site was accessed via Hanham Road and located within the Wimborne Conservation Area. No changes were proposed to existing parking arrangements. The proposal included the installation of two bollards opposite a turning circle to regulate access to a private car park for authorised users only, via a mobile app. Photographs were presented showing the car park and surrounding context. No objections were received. The application also proposed the rebuilding of a red brick boundary wall to the west of the site, forming part of the landscape boundary. Recycled bricks were to be used to match the existing character. Additional photographs illustrated the current condition and design context.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

There were no questions or comments.

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 as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Spencer Flower, and seconded by Cllr Toni Coombs, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant permission for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

11. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

12. Exempt Business

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 1.02 pm

Chairman

.....