

WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 17 JULY 2025

Present: Cllrs Dave Bolwell (Chair), Neil Eysenck (Vice-Chair), Belinda Bawden, Matt Bell, Simon Christopher, Paul Kimber, Craig Monks, David Northam, Louie O'Leary, David Shortell and Kate Wheller

Apologies: Cllrs Pete Roper

Also present: Cllr Roland Tarr

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

Marianne Ashworth, Bob Burden (Senior Planning Officer), Ann Collins (Area Manager – Western and Southern Team), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), James Lytton-Trevers (Lead Project Officer), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Katrina Trevett (Development Management Team Leader) and Louis Wicks (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice)

12. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Pete Roper.

13. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Bell declared an interest in item 8 due to having a family member with a property nearby and did not participate in that item.

Cllr Bawden declared that she was pre-determined on item 7 and spoke as the Ward Member.

Cllr Wheller declared that item 8 had been considered by Weymouth Town Council, however she had not participated in the item when it was considered and was not pre-determined.

14. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2025 were confirmed and signed.

15. 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.

16. **P/FUL/2024/06791 Picnic Area Café New Street Lane Bridport DT6 6AS**

The Senior Planning Officer used plans and aerial photographs to identify the site and explained the proposal, relevant planning policies, and site context. It was explained that there was a range of alternative sites that were suitable for stopping in the nearby area for cars and that for HGV's the nearest sites for stopping were in Honiton and Dorchester, however there was no policy in the Neighbourhood Plan that required provision of stopping areas for HGVs.

The proposed plans and layout were shown to members and the trees that were proposed to be removed and the replacement trees were highlighted on the plans. Landscape sections were provided, which indicated that the site would be largely screened by planting.

The main planning issues were summarised and officers considered that the application was acceptable subject to conditions.

Ms Tilley spoke as the agent for the application, noting that National Highways had given careful consideration to the location of the development and this site had been identified as the most suitable. National Highways recognised the loss of the rest facility, however noted the positive benefits of the proposal including the creation of jobs.

Belinda Bawden left the Council Chamber from 10:27 – 10:30 and did not participate in the rest of the item.

Cllr Hartmann, representing Symondsburry Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. He noted that the roads had previously been serviced from a depot in Honiton and did not see why this could not continue. The site lay outside of the Development Boundary and within the National Landscape and it was felt that the development would be more intrusive than the current picnic area.

In response to a question from one member, the Senior Planning Officer clarified that 5 jobs were likely to be rolled over from other sites, which would result in the creation of approximately 13-18 new full-time jobs.

Several members expressed concern over the loss of the rest facility; however, it was explained by the Senior Planning Officer that alternative sites had been considered by the applicant and the reasons for the applicant not pursuing them were listed in the report.

It was proposed by Cllr Kimber and seconded by Cllr Northam to grant the application.

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

17. **WD/D/20/002002 Manor Farm Manor Farm Lane Winterbourne Abbas ST2 9LR**

The Lead Project Officer presented the application, which was for a development consisting of 32 dwellings and associated works. The existing buildings were identified on an aerial photograph of the site and photographs were also provided of the agricultural buildings and stone wall to the front of the site.

The proposed plans were shown to members, showing the design and scale of the proposed dwellings in each part of the site. It was explained that an attenuation basin was proposed to manage surface water run off and a dedicated play area and car park, to serve the nearby school, were to be built on site. 11 affordable dwellings could be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement.

The key planning issues were explained and it was considered that, while there were benefits of the proposal, it was unacceptable in terms of flood risk. The access to the site fell within flood zones 2 and 3 and the application failed the Sequential Test, as it was determined that there were other available alternative sites that would be at a lesser risk of flooding within the catchment area. Photographs of the site in a state of flooding were provided and the attenuation basin was proposed to assist the management of the current surface water flooding issues and this scheme had been approved by drainage engineers.

Mr Smythe spoke as the applicant for the application, noting that a significant amount of time and money had been spent on the application so far and that there were significant benefits to the proposal, including the provision of 32 dwellings, which the applicant intended to provide as 100% affordable housing.

Mr Moir spoke as the agent for the application, noting that all but one issue had been resolved by working with the Planning Authority and the real-world harm of the flooding issue would be minimal.

The following answers were provided in response to members questions:

- There had been a successful appeal on a planning application elsewhere in respect of the sequential test, however it wasn't considered that this set a precedent, as there were different circumstances to this application, namely that the Local Authority did not have a five-year housing land supply in that case.
- The applicant had not yet entered into a S106 legal agreement, as there were costs associated with doing so and the application was being recommended for refusal.
- There was safe pedestrian access out of the site that would be available, should the road access be flooded.
- The catchment area for the sequential test was a 3-mile radius and sites within that area were considered for alternative locations.
- The Environment Agency does not apply the Sequential Test, which was why they did not comment on that aspect of the application.

Members had the opportunity to debate the merits of the application, having asked technical questions of the planning officers. Members were generally in agreement that the scheme was well designed and made good use of a currently derelict site. They emphasised the benefits of additional housing provision, even if only 11 could be secured as affordable housing via a S106 legal agreement.

One member raised a concern about the access for emergency vehicles in a situation where the access to the site was flooded and saw this as a significant risk to the safety of the residents in the development.

The meeting adjourned to allow officers to present draft conditions for the committee to consider 11:54 – 12:08

It was proposed by Cllr Monks and seconded by Cllr Northam that the application be granted, for the reason that the significant benefits of the scheme, including the provision of 32 dwellings, 11 of which would be secured as affordable, the car park for the school, the play area and improvements to the footpath outweighed the risk of the 1 in 30 year flooding event that would impact the access to the site.

Decision: That authority be delegated to the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement and the Area Manager for the Southern and Western Area Team to grant subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and planning conditions to be first agreed in writing by the Chairman of the committee.

18. P/VOC/2024/06786 5 Overton Close Timber Hill Lyme Regis DT7 3HQ

Cllr Monks and Cllr O'Leary left the meeting at 12:20

The meeting adjourned from 12:20 – 13:00.

Cllr Bawden moved to the public speaking section of the Council Chamber.

The Development Management Team Leader presented the application, which was to vary a condition on a previously approved application to change the ridge height on the dwelling from an increase of 1.3m to 1.6m.

The site within Lyme Regis was identified on a map and the nearby South West Coast Path and the entrance to the Spittles were highlighted. Photographs were provided of the other properties in the area, showing a variety of different styles in the area.

The proposed plans were shown to members and were overlaid against the original plans, to give a sense of the proposed change in the height of the dwelling, which was 300mm. Various photographs from the street and footpath looking towards the site were provided, which showed that the site would benefit from the screening of trees in the summer to minimise views of the site and it was not considered that there would be a significant impact on the landscape as a result of the proposed change.

The key planning issues were summarised and although it was recognised that the higher ridgeline would impact on the views of a neighbouring property, it was not considered to be overwhelmingly overbearing.

Mr Offord, a nearby resident, spoke in objection to the application, stating that the dwelling was too large and overly dominant for the area. He stated that the large size of dwelling detracted from the National Landscape and South West Coast

Path and that the dwelling would be significantly larger than the other chalet bungalows in the area.

Mr Bastin spoke in support of the application, he explained that there had been a mistake with the original drawings, which resulted in the dwelling being built 300mm higher than intended and the higher ridge height was not intentional.

Ms Wells spoke as the agent for the application. She noted that the design and style of the dwelling had previously been approved and the application was just to vary the height of the dwelling by 300mm. It was explained that this had been a genuine mistake in the construction of the dwelling, however the higher ridge height was not a significant change to the previously approved application.

Cllr Bawden spoke as the Ward Member for Lyme and Charmouth. She explained that the Town Council had also objected to this application and that the comparison to the nearby former care home was misleading as the other chalet bungalows in the area were of a modest size and this dwelling would be completely out of character for the road. She disagreed with the views that the application wouldn't result in harm to area.

Cllr Bell left the meeting at 13:31.

Cllr Bawden left the Council Chamber 13:38.

Several members asked for the photographs to be brought back so they could get a better idea of the appearance of the dwelling from various viewpoints. In response to one member's question the Development Management Team Leader explained that a previous application had been refused due to both the height and proximity of the dwelling to neighbours and this application was not considered to be overbearing at the proposed height.

Several members expressed support for the application, noting the relatively modest change in the height of the dwelling, compared to what was originally proposed, however one member stated that they believed that there was harm being caused by the dwelling to the setting of the area and the Spittles.

It was proposed by Cllr Kimber and seconded by Cllr Shortell that the application be approved.

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

19. P/FUL/2025/000780 46 St Davids Road Weymouth DT4 9LP

Cllr Bawden and Cllr Monks returned to the Council Chamber at 13:56.

Cllr Christopher left the meeting at 13:57.

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Senior Planning Officer identified the site and explained the proposal, which

consisted of the demolition of 3 disused garages and the erection of a 3-bedroom, 1.5 storey dwelling, with associated parking and ground works.

Plans of the site and proposed dwelling were shown to members and the relative distances to the neighbouring properties were provided. Photographs of the site in its current condition were also shown, as well as photographs from the garden of a neighbouring property, to give members an indication of the level of impact that the new dwelling would have on neighbouring amenity.

The application was considered to be acceptable in terms of design and amenity and highways had confirmed they were happy with the two off-road parking spaces provided. It was not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

Mr Leerre spoke in objection to the application, as a resident of one of the neighbouring properties, he expressed that although he had no objection to the principle of development, the proposed dwelling was too large for the size of the plot and would result in loss of outlook and loss of sunlight for the neighbouring properties.

Mr Twigg spoke on behalf of Mr Tufnail, who was a resident of one of the neighbouring properties. He stated that the dwelling would cover half of the garden boundary to the neighbouring property and that the dwelling would also have a very small garden and cramped parking spaces.

Ms Rasch spoke in support of the application. She stated that the application fell within the Defined Development Boundary and that no detrimental impact would be caused to the neighbouring properties, as the view from the dormer window would look out towards the front of the property and all other windows were on the ground floor.

The Vice-chair read out a statement on behalf of Cllr Webb, a Ward Member for Rodwell and Wyke, who could not be present at the meeting. She noted that there was significant concern amongst the local residents about the scale and mass of the dwelling. She also raised concerns about procedural process for the application and cited the lack of a noise impact assessment, and no tree survey or asbestos report.

The Senior Planning Officer clarified that a noise impact assessment wasn't required following consultation with the applicant, the garages already had consent to be demolished and the tree officer had determined that an on-site survey wasn't required.

The following responses were provided to members questions:

- It was considered that there was sufficient outside amenity space for occupiers of the dwelling to use.
- There were two roof lights at a high level in the dwelling that would not allow a view of the neighbouring properties and a single dormer window to the front of the property, therefore officers did not consider there to be an issue with overlooking onto neighbouring properties.

- The garden was approximately 34sqm, which was considered a sufficient size and there were two parking spaces available to the front of the property.

Several members raised concerns with the application, that included the size of the dwelling in relation to the size of the plot it was located on and a lack of outside space and the impact on neighbouring amenity from the construction of a large dwelling in close proximity to the existing neighbouring properties.

However, other members expressed that although they understood the concerns raised by other members of the committee, they did not feel that their concerns warranted refusal of the application.

It was proposed by Cllr Eysenck and seconded by Cllr Monks, that the application be granted.

Upon being put to a vote the motion fell.

The meeting adjourned from 14:50 – 15:00.

It was proposed by Cllr Wheller and seconded by Cllr Bawden, that the application be refused for the reason that the dwelling was oversized for the site resulting in a lack of amenity space and that it was out of keeping with the local area.

Upon being put to the vote the motion fell.

It was proposed by Cllr Northam and seconded by Cllr Monks, that the application be granted.

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

20. P/VOC/2025/01396 The Pavilion Complex The Esplanade Weymouth DT4 8ED

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application, which was for the variation of condition on an approved application, granted in 2017. The location of the site was identified on a map and aerial photograph. The approved elevation plan was shown in comparison to the proposed and the changes were highlighted to members. The sign was proposed to be rebuilt and raised and was already situated on site in the new location and it was no longer proposed for there to be a balcony and terrace area and the first-floor extension would instead extend across this area. Photographs of the building and the sign were shown.

The planning issues were summarised and the application was considered to be acceptable.

It was proposed by Cllr Northam and seconded by Cllr Wheller, that the application be granted.

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

21. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

22. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

23. **Update Sheet**

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 3.21 pm

Chairman

.....