

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 8 JULY 2025

Present: Cllrs Alex Brenton, Barrie Cooper, Les Fry, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout, James Vitali and Carl Woode

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

Lara Atree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Cass Worman (Planning Officer), John Miles (Democratic Services Officer) and Annabel Cox (Planning Officer).

74. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Cllr David Taylor.

75. Declarations of Interest

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

76. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 27th May 2025 were confirmed and signed.

77. 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.

78. P/FUL/2024/04528, Garages at Wingfield Road, Sherborne, DT9 3HH

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 application was to demolish a block of 48 garages, 37 which were currently occupied. The garages were mostly used for storage, and it was estimated that 5 garages were used for cars. The site would be redeveloped with two dwellings including landscaping and associated works. Each parking space would have electric charging stations. The Highway Authority was satisfied with road safety and parking.

Public Participation

Cllr Jon Andrews spoke as a member of the public and not as a Councillor. He had been a resident of Wingfield Road between 1969 to 1975 and remembered playing

football around there, but this morning a fire engine would not have been able to get around from the Richmond Road junction along Wingfield Road due to the number of parked vehicles. He informed that Wingfield Road has 72 houses in total, and not one parking space was available in Wingfield Road which is a hazard to public safety. The houses were a very nice design but just in the wrong place. There was one car parked and this morning 4 vans. He asked the Committee to not accept the application, as the sheltered accommodation needed emergency vehicle access, which would not have been able to get there this morning, without damaging and moving vehicles due to parked vehicles. The garages were for people who were self-employed, and demolishing these garages would mean that these people would have to find other garages which there is none available in Sherborne.

Ms Lindridge explained that she was a resident of half acres, and many residents were elderly and disabled and her living room and bedroom was 7 foot away from the garages. There would be a loss of privacy, dust upheaval and traffic disruption and essential services would be at risk. She wanted a peaceful life and did not want the hassle that the demolition would bring.

Ms Day informed that amenities, fire services, ambulances came in most days, and supermarket vans needed to get in and out and residents relied on taxis and cars to take them into town, and were unable to park in their own parking spaces as lots of car park on Wingfield Road. She stated that the Council should consider the implications on behalf of the residents, and there was 7 feet between the garages and herself. Some residents had crutches, wheelchairs, mobility scooters, and needed those pavements to use and not cars parked on them. As for drop down curves people park on them and ambulances and fire services would not be able to get in.

Andrew Tregay (the Agent for the application) explained that the application was to create two new dwellings in a highly sustainable location, a short distance from the town centre and no doubt a suitable location for two dwellings. There had been no technical objections from the Council specialist officers or highway officers. He acknowledged that there had been some concerns from residents over the parking situation and he reiterated what was set out in the officer report. It was a private garage block, not associated with any other specific development, was not a part of the Council's parking strategy and did not have any obligations to maintain parking space for any particular properties. The garages supported a low number of cars and were reaching the end of their life span. 25% of the units were currently vacant and the applicant did not monitor the units but were used mostly for storage rather than parking and the units were too small to store modern vehicles. The houses would be limited to 1 and a half storeys, have electric charging points, and there were no technical reasons for why this application should be refused.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Fry asked why people were parking on the roads and if they were working locally or was it due to free parking?**
- **Cllr Jespersen asked about the access by emergency vehicles and delivery vans to the bungalows.**

- Cllr Crabb commented that Half Acres behind did get a high number of emergency vehicles, more than you would in the normal neighbourhood, as carers park there.
- Cllr Vitali commented that development would intensify the parking situation, and it was important that the applicants did not intensify parking issues.
- Cllr Rideout requested reassurance that the height of the dwellings would not impact the enjoyment of the neighbours' gardens or create overshadowing.
- Cllr Jespersen commented that it was a private site, and the landowner could decide to demolish the garages and use the site for anything else at any time. Parking at Wingfield Road was not a relevant issue to the application, and the only thing that the committee should consider is if it exacerbated the issues on the roads. There were adequate gardens and there were no grounds to refuse the application.
- Cllr Brenton commented that the dwellings would be built to modern standards, insulated, she added that this was a planning application rather than a parking 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 representations; 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 Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Brenton.

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report and in the appendix.

79. **P/FUL/2023/01247, 10 High East Street, Dorchester, DT1 1HS**

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 application was to erect a first-floor extension to provide 1 No. unit of residential accommodation. The roof was designed to protect the amenity of the window. There would be no direct overlooking, and the second room was intended to be office store, rather than a bedroom. The application was in a town centre location, with a variety of buildings. The roof was designed so that light could reach the window and there would be no blocking of the window and light of the window would not be significantly impacted as it was East facing.

Public Participation

Mr Kendle lived at 5 Icen Mews, the back-wall of the proposed development was the back-wall of his courtyard garden, and this wall was less than 12 metres from the living room of his house. He explained the overbearing nature of the proposal, and he referenced that the officers report stated that the development would not be overbearing due to the courtyard already experiencing an enclosed character and the development only amounted to an additional 60cm of height of the party-wall. He explained that the officers report underplayed the effect of the development. The boundary wall at the end of his garden was already the tallest

structure enclosing the space, and crucially, it was the only boundary visible directly from his living room. This made it the most prominent feature from both inside his home and garden.

The proposal sought to significantly increase the height of that wall, with a sloping roof rising further behind it. That change significantly worsened the sense of enclosure and visual dominance of the structure, contrary to the protections offered by Policy 25 of the North Dorset Local Plan, which required development to safeguard the amenity of existing residents, including protection from overbearing structures and loss of outlook. This development only represents an additional 60cms of height.

The officer's report included that the proposal would only amount to a roughly 60cm increase in height, or a 14% increase in the height of the current party-wall. He informed that this claim was inaccurate and disingenuous for two reasons: The report stated the additional height of the party-wall is 60cms but the sloping roof, rises above the party-wall by a further 140cms and that the highest point was 100cms back from the party-wall. A 200cm increase was significantly higher than a 60cm one that the report drew your attention to.

The architectural drawings on which the 60cm figure was based were inaccurate because they: Stipulated that the floor-space between the current ground-floor and the new first-floor was 14cms when at a minimum, taking into account joists and fire-protection, it would need to be at least 29cms. The drawings also indicated that the current parapet wall is 429cms high, but he measured it, and it was only 402cms at its highest point and 390cms at its lowest. Therefore, allowing for a realistic depth of floor-space, and for the actual height of the parapet wall, the party-wall would need to be 114cms higher than the parapet wall currently is at its lowest point, and, when including the sloping roof, the development would be 254cms higher than the current wall. So rather than the 14% increase in the height suggested in the officer's report, this development actually amounted to a 63.5% increase in height. He concluded that it would significantly overshadow and overbear the property and the inaccuracy in the drawings suggested that the architectural drawings could not be trusted and therefore, any development would be based upon must be objected.

Ms Pacitti explained that she was the co-owner of 10A High East Street, situated directly to the west of 10 High East Street. Her property featured a single window in the upstairs rear room, which served as the exclusive source of external light for that space. The proposed construction would significantly diminish the amount of light entering the room. Although the height of the build had been reduced, it would negatively affect the light levels, and the impact would be more pronounced in winter exacerbating the concern. During winter months, light availability was already limited, necessitating an increase in natural light rather than a decrease. This development would result in an exceedingly gloomy environment, requiring artificial lighting even during daytime hours.

The proposed construction posed a severe infringement on her established right to light, which had been recognized for over two decades. The flat roof adjacent to her property raised significant concerns, as it could lead to damp issues due to the accumulation of rainwater and debris. She requested clarification regarding the method of joining the flat roof to her structure and the direction of water runoff.

Under the current proposals, there appeared to be no provision for runoff management, leading to the potential trapping of water in the channel between the front and rear elevations. She expressed concern regarding several vents for her bathroom and kitchen located on the wall designated for construction. There were legitimate worries about the possibility of these outlets becoming obstructed. The current submission did not adequately address how these concerns would be mitigated, and she remained sceptical that a party wall agreement would provide a solution. The proposed construction would infringe upon the privacy of her rear balcony, as it would be directly overlooked by the new build, which featured windows facing her property.

The area was already densely built and lacked privacy; this development would exacerbate that issue. The new placement of the extractor fan—now positioned lower between 9 High East Street and 10A High East Street, and at the same height as her window—raised additional concerns. The odour from the extractor could become confined between the front and rear elevations, significantly impacting the upstairs room. The existing odour report was insufficient, as it did not consider the new circumstances in which odour could be channelled and trapped in the corridor formed between the adjacent buildings. She raised reservations regarding the implications of ongoing maintenance for the property, particularly given that it was located in a conservation area. The proposed development would restrict access to the rear and side of her building, thereby hindering the ability to perform routine repairs to the roof, walls, and balcony. This could have detrimental effects on her property, and the revised plans fail to address these concerns.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Jespersen commented that she was not confident that the layout of the development was the best use of space in terms of living conditions. She questioned whether the committee could add conditions that prevents future occupiers from using the area designated as an office as a bedroom. She queried the amenities of the flat itself and whether residents had any access to outside space for drying washing, putting out their bins and a place to park their bike. She commented about the odour in small spaces and that odours can settle. She raised concerns with the flat roof, concerns with flue, smaller lobby, loss of light to the living room of 10 a. The development was overbearing on the courtyard garden of number 10 a, and no place for domestic living.**
- **Cllr Fry raised concerns over the noise and smell and the flat roof being very hard to maintain and could leak. There would be a loss of privacy to the area and potential damage to surrounding buildings.**
- **Cllr Potheary expressed concerns that there were too many problems that would need to be put right by condition. She would have preferred to see method statement put in with the documents. She was most concerned about the flue, in line with balcony in 10 A sitting out there being on the same level, would be appalling. If approved the development would be half built before we realised all sorts of issues.**

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 representations; 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 Pothecary, and seconded by Cllr Jones.

Decision: To refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below and in the appendix.

Reasons for refusals:

The proposal would lead to a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of 10A High East Street due to inadequate daylight to the living space of the adjacent property due to the proximity height and design of the proposed development, contrary to Policy ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

The proposal would lead to a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of 5 Icen Mews due to overbearing and overshadowing of the garden area of the adjacent property due to the proximity height and design of the proposed development, contrary to Policy ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

The proposal due to its size and layout would fail to make sufficient provision for bin stores, recycling facilities, drying areas, cycle parking, mobility scooter storage and private amenity/garden space and associated storage and composting facilities, which would adversely impact on the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed residential unit, contrary to policy ENV.11 and ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

80. **P/LBC/2023/01251, 10 High East Street, Dorchester, DT1 1HS**

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. This application was to consider the listed building consent and looking at the impact only on heritage assets and the historic fabric of the building.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Jespersen commented that she did not see any reason for why this application should be refused listed building consent as the Conservation Officers were keen on the improvements this development would bring.**

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 representations; 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 Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Rideout.

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report and in the appendix.

81. **P/HOU/2024/06120, Sunnydale, White Lackington, Piddletrenthide DT2 7QU**

Cllr Vitali left the meeting at 12:33 and gave his apologies.

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 application was to demolish store and erect a two Bay Garage/Workshop. Photographs of the map showed the location, in an AONB. The site access, tree protection plan and the full extent of vegetation along northern boundary were presented to the Committee.

Public Participation

No public participation.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Brenton asked if there was rainwater collection on the building and she appreciated the solar panels on the roof and suspended floor.**
- **Cllr Rideout asked about the back access and whether there were bat boxes.**
- **Cllr Fry asked about a water retention condition and some form of water storage on the site.**

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 Brenton, and seconded by Cllr Rideout.

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report and in the appendix.

82. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

83. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 12.48 pm

Chairman

.....