

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 17 DECEMBER 2025

Present: Cllrs David Tooke (Chair), Duncan Sowry-House (Vice-Chair), Alex Brenton, Beryl Ezzard, Scott Florek, Hannah Hobbs-Chell, David Morgan, Julie Robinson and Andy Skeats

Apologies: Cllrs Toni Coombs, Spencer Flower and Barry Goringe

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), Claire Hicks (Planning Officer), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), Clare Marshall and Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic & Governance Services Officer)

65. Declarations of Interest

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

66. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 November were confirmed and signed.

67. 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.

68. P/FUL/2024/06769 - Shady Glades, Long Lane, Wimborne, BH21 7AQ

Councillor Hobbs-Chell entered the meeting at 10:16.

The Development Management Team Leader presented the application for the change of use of land to a dog exercise park and the formation of car parking areas, along with the fencing and the placement of a storage container. The application history was outlined, noting that the original decision, that had granted permission under delegated powers had been quashed.

The site location within Cole Hill was shown on a map, along with a proposal plan identifying the main and additional entrances to the two separate dog parks, both outlined on the plan. It was explained that both parts of the park would be

available for hire during daylight hours, with no lighting proposed on site. Photographs of the storage container were shown, which would be used for storing land maintenance equipment. The park areas were confirmed as approximately 0.7 hectares and 1.5 hectares. It was noted that customers would be required to sign up to terms and conditions when booking and CCTV would be installed on site to ensure that users of the park complied with the rules.

The use of the park was considered to have limited visual impact from the highway. Photographs of the access and both dog parks, including their boundaries with the public right of way, were presented. The context of the location was discussed. Concerns had been raised that it was too far from the urban area, but officers considered the proposal to represent rural land diversification. The Highways team confirmed they were satisfied with the visibility splays and the road accessing the site already served dwellings, public land and two public houses, with some wide sections allowing passing. Drivers were expected to drive with reasonable consideration and the dog park would operate on a pre-booking basis, meaning vehicle movements would be controlled.

The impact on heritage assets was considered, noting that the boundary extended around listed buildings. It was noted that the highway was in regular use and additional cars generated by the proposal were not expected to change the character of the road. The development would not result in any significant changed experience of the heritage assets. The ecological impacts of the proposal were outlined and it was explained that there had been concerns raised by third parties about impacts on protected species. However, no evidence had been identified that showed that protected species were using the site and the Council's Natural Environment team were satisfied that more than 10% biodiversity net gain could be achieved and that protected species would not be harmed.

The impact on neighbouring amenity was addressed, with noise identified as a significant concern of objectors. A noise impact assessment had been submitted in support of the application, which considered the impact of six dogs and six people in park 1 closest to the neighbouring properties. Officers considered that the impact on residential properties would be limited and that baseline noise levels were not unusual given the proximity to the highway and a flight path. Site management was expected to be taken seriously by the applicant and officers considered it reasonable that users comply with the rules, supported by CCTV for enforcement.

Neighbouring land use included sheep and goats adjacent to the site and users would be warned to avoid hiring dog park 2 if their dogs were sensitive to animals. Double gates would provide an airlock system and dogs would be supervised at all times. Fencing was in place and would be monitored to ensure it was maintained, as required by condition 4.

The application was considered acceptable and recommended for approval. A third-party concern was addressed about land ownership certificates not being properly completed. The applicant had served notice to the previous owner, so the recommendation was to delegate authority to grant permission after the 21-day notice period had passed. An amended version of condition 5 was presented to members which would require the Council to be notified any complaints and where

judged necessary, the Local Authority could request information on steps taken to resolve complaints.

James Blake, Neil Taylor, William Shakespeare and Geoff Chopping spoke in objection to the application. They raised concerns including the proximity to residential dwellings and livestock and amenity impact the proposal would have in terms of noise from dogs barking and increased vehicle movements. Concern was also raised about the applicants operations plan, which they noted did not adequately address how noise nuisance would be prevented and was reliant on users of the parks complying with the terms of service. In addition it was claimed that landscaping works had been carried out prior to an ecological assessment.

Samantha Taylor and the agent for the application, Emily Jeffries, spoke in support of the application. They stated that there was a clear need for dog parks in the area to allow people to safely exercise their dogs. It was explained that the applicant had worked with officers to provide a revised operations plan and that CCTV would be used to enforce this. In addition any impact on nearby livestock would be limited, due to hedging and fencing separating the two fields.

The local Ward Member, Cllr Chakawhata submitted a written statement that was read out by the Vice-chair. He stated that he didn't believe that highways concerns had been addressed sufficiently, as Long Lane was a rural, narrow road, with few passing places and the proposal would generate increased vehicle movements. In addition, he stated that the CCTV was not an adequate measure as it would only allow intervention after complaints had been made, rather than preventing harm before it occurs. He also stated that it represented intensification of development within the green belt.

Officers provided the following responses to members questions and comments:

- The two dog parks would operate as two separate private areas for hire, so there would not be multiple unacquainted customers using the same park at once.
- Banned breeds were required to have 1:1 ratio with a handler.
- The applicant intended to check the entrance of every new customer on site using the CCTV.
- The CCTV would have solar and battery power and would also provide an audio feed.
- There would be no on-site management presence during operating hours and this was consistent with the operation of other dog parks.
- A condition would require maintenance of the fencing alongside the right of way prior to use.
- The proposed operation hours of the park would be from 07:00 to 20:00 or between daylight hours in winter. Members could constrain the timings further if judged necessary.
- There would be a maximum of 3 vehicles allowed per booking and CCTV would be used to monitor customers arriving.
- A maximum of 6 dogs would be allowed in the southern park and 10 in the northern park at one time.
- Harm from noise couldn't be entirely ruled out, however officers considered that the CCTV would allow for the parks to be monitored and action could be taken in response to noise complaints by the operator.

- Comparison with dog park at Three Legged Cross was not appropriate as that park was not authorised (planning application under consideration).
- Officers understand that there were protected species within the vicinity of the application site, however there was no evidence to suggest that they were using the site and the Natural Environment team were satisfied with the proposal.
- The business would have a website with a feedback form to allow complaints to be submitted.
- The application had come to the committee for determination as it met the criteria of being a major application.
- Long Lane had a speed limit of 60mph, however Highways officers considered that users of the road were unlikely to reach the top limit and the nature of the road encouraged maximum speeds of 30-40mph at its widest points.
- The noise assessment was taken from the nearest receptor, which was the closest residential property, as it was standard practice.
- There was one incident of the Council's Environmental Protection team following up on a complaint about another dog park in Dorset, however they did not find evidence of unacceptable noise levels.
- Regular checks of the fences would be carried out to ensure they were in good condition.
- There was a line of site between the dog park and the neighbouring field containing livestock, however officers considered that the boundary was sufficiently screened to mitigate adverse impacts.
- Work had commenced on site before the original decision was quashed.
- It was not known where the operator would be located, however they would be available to contact if there were any complaints.
- The site was understood to benefit from phone network coverage
- There was no proposed water or toilet facilities on the site.
- Officers did not consider it reasonable to condition on-site management, as it would require further development of the site in providing more facilities for an employee.
- The operations plan identified that the CCTV would be reviewed in real time when new customers were accessing the site and periodically when existing customers were using the park.
- Members could condition that signage with the operators contact information be installed within the site.

Having had the opportunity to debate the merits of the application, several members expressed that they felt that the conditions in place were sufficient to mitigate against any harms and that the proposal was appropriate for the rural location of the site. It was proposed by Cllr Sowry-House and seconded by Cllr Brenton to grant the application with an added condition, requiring signage be installed on site featuring a manned telephone number.

Upon being put to the vote the motion fell.

The meeting adjourned 12:13 – 12:29.

Several members expressed concerns that due to the intensification of visitors without any onsite management presence, issues of noise disturbance or failure to meet the site rules could not be effectively managed so the proposal would be likely to result in harm.

It was proposed by Cllr Skeats and seconded by Cllr Ezzard, that the application be refused as the proposed use as a dog park would cause additional noise and disturbance which the Operations plan, due to the unsupervised nature of the park, could not reasonably be relied upon to effectively mitigate and manage. The resulting harm from the use of the site and additional traffic movements on neighbouring amenity, the character of the rural area and surrounding livestock arising from noise and disturbance, would be contrary to policies HE2 of the Christchurch Local and East Dorset Local Plan, saved policy DES2 of the East Dorset Local Plan and NPPF paragraphs 135 and 187.

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

69. P/FUL/2025/04931 - Land rear of 11-12 Egdon Close, Bere Regis, BH20 7LQ

The Committee agreed to extend the meeting beyond three hours.

The Development Management Team Leader presented the application for the erection of a dwelling, with the location of the site shown within Bere Regis. Site constraints were displayed on a map and it was noted that land adjacent to the site was owned by Dorset Council.

Photographs of the site and its access were shown, confirming that the land was in private ownership and enclosed on both sides. Additional photographs illustrated views of the site looking towards the school.

Existing and proposed site plans were presented, showing a single bungalow with two parking spaces and a garden area. It was highlighted that the Council did not have a five-year land supply so the tilted balance in favour of development applied. The proposal was considered infill development that was not out of keeping with the area. The slope of the site would allow the bungalow to sit comfortably within wider views. Proposed elevations were shown, with a hipped roof design reflecting other properties on Egdon Close. Floor plans and roof plans were also displayed.

The proposal was assessed as causing no loss of amenity or light. The window would only allow oblique views of the school and neighbouring gardens, so no adverse impact on amenity was expected. A condition would require that the bathroom window be obscure glazed and another condition required the rooflight above the stairwell to be non-opening and obscure glazed, with permitted development rights removed for further windows.

A proposed surface water drainage plan was submitted. Although the site was not at risk of flooding, there was flooding nearby. The drainage plan offered potential betterment and biodiversity enhancement and soft landscaping would be required by condition, along with Community Infrastructure Levy contributions.

Highway safety and parking were considered, with engineers raising no issues and noting that vehicle movements would be fewer than previous uses. Accessibility for fire and emergency vehicles was discussed, as the width of the access did not meet the 3.7 metres required for a fire engine to reverse into the site. Compliance with building regulations would be necessary and the agent had confirmed that a sprinkler system would be installed to ensure compliance.

The loss of off-street parking was raised, as the application site had previously been used for resident parking. It was acknowledged that residents were concerned about this loss, but alternative parking had been provided and the ownership of the land was now in different hands. Seven alternative payable licenced spaces had been provided by Aster, which was considered sufficient to offset the loss.

Matthew Holmes spoke as the agent for the application. He noted that the site would provide a similar sized plot to other homes in the area and the scheme also offered biodiversity enhancements on site. He stated that the development was well designed and in keeping with the area and that residential amenity would be protected through the proposed conditions.

Officers provided the following responses to members questions:

- The 7 parking spaces provided to the east of Egdon Close were not free to use.
- Access to the neighbours gate would be a matter of land law for the parties to decide.
- There was previously a garage block on the site of the 7 parking spaces.
- The Construction Management plan would require hours of working to be submitted for approval.

It was proposed by Cllr Sowry-House and seconded by Cllr Hobbs-Chell, that the application be approved.

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

70. P/FUL/2025/03321 - Land at Northern Slip Road, West Moors Junction, West Moors Road, Ferndown

Cllrs Andy Skeats, Julie Robinson, and Hannah Hobbs-Chell left the meeting at 12:59.

The Planning Officer presented the application for the demolition of existing buildings and removal of storage containers, and the erection of a replacement building for fireworks sale and storage. The location of the site was shown on a map, and it was noted that the use for seasonal sale of fireworks and storage was established, with two buildings and storage containers currently used for seasonal sales and year-round storage.

The proposal was to demolish the existing buildings and storage containers and erect a new building. A photograph of the site from the road and plans of the proposed building were shown. The site was screened by mature trees, and the design was considered to be in accordance with policy. The proposed building represented an increase in volume compared to the two existing buildings and would also be higher than the existing buildings, but it would remain modest in height. The proposal was considered to be of modest scale, resulting in a limited loss of openness in the green belt. It was concluded that the proposal accorded with the exception in the National Planning Policy Framework and was therefore not inappropriate development within the green belt.

The Slop Bog Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) lay to the south of the site and impacts on the SSSI would be managed by condition. The local Ward Member had raised concern about the lack of water on site in case of a fire, but it was noted that the site already had permission for fireworks sale and storage. The impact on trees was considered and the latest Environment Agency mapping was referenced, showing the site within flood zones 2 and 3, however the use of the site fell within the 'less vulnerable' classification.

Flooding maps were displayed, indicating that parking spaces would be at risk of flooding. This triggered the requirement for a sequential test, but no sequential test had been submitted. However, the surface water management plan was deemed acceptable by the Council's flood risk team. While the proposal failed to comply with policy requiring a sequential test, it was considered that the reduction in flood risk provided by the proposal outweighed this policy conflict.

Dan Wilden spoke as the agent for the application. He noted that the proposal was planned to take place only on the strip of tarmac running through the site, meaning there would be no impact on trees or the surrounding environment. He also noted that the current buildings on site were reaching the end of their lives and replacing them would provide a safer premises for the business. In addition, the applicant was required to apply for a yearly licence from the Council and the site was regularly inspected by Trading Standards.

In response to questions and comments from members, officers provided the following responses:

- Trading Standards dealt with safety issues in relation to the storage of the fireworks.
- The buildings were proposed to be constructed out of profile sheet cladding.
- The road into the site would be wide enough to accommodate delivery vans and small lorries.

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 the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

71. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

72. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision Sheet

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 1.20 pm

Chairman

.....