

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 14 JANUARY 2026

Present: Cllrs David Tooke (Chair), Alex Brenton, Toni Coombs, Beryl Ezzard, Spencer Flower, Barry Goringe, David Morgan, Julie Robinson and Andy Skeats

Apologies: Cllrs Duncan Sowry-House, Scott Florek and Hannah Hobbs-Chell

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), Mike Garrity (Corporate Director for Planning), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), Diana Mezzogori-Curran (Senior Planning Officer) and Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic & Governance Services Officer)

73. Declarations of Interest

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

74. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2026 were confirmed and signed.

75. 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.

76. Application P/FUL/2024/04629 - 26 Canford Bottom Colehill BH21 2HE

The Legal Business Partner presented the report for the application which had first been considered at the meeting held on 3 September. At that meeting, the committee had resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Members were advised that a letter from Lidl's solicitors had been received asserting that the Committee had not given reasons for its decision following which officers sought legal advice. The advice to members was that, while the Committee had given reasons for its decision, it had not expressly set out the harms against which the benefits it had identified had been balanced and there was therefore a risk that the reasons could be regarded as not sufficiently full. Members were also informed that the full wording of the proposed conditions was now included in the updated report.

The committee was shown the location of the site within the wider area, its relationship to the surrounding heathland and Green Belt, and its position within the immediate surroundings. The extent of the area falling within the Green Belt was identified. Images of the site from various viewpoints were displayed, along with photographs of nearby residential buildings and the site itself. A summary of the proposed development was provided, including a food store of approximately 1,780 square metres with a height of 6.3 metres, associated car parking and a new vehicular access. Members were shown the site plan for the proposed food store and parking, the site as existing and as proposed and the proposed elevations.

The recommendation before the committee was to expand upon the wording of the original decision and to approve the full wording of the proposed conditions.

It was proposed by Cllr Flower and seconded by Cllr Goringe, that the application be granted subject to conditions set out in the officer report. Cllr Flower stated that it was understood that the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore contrary to policy, however he considered that the provision of supermarkets in the area was inadequate in choice and affordability. There had also been significant housing growth in Wimborne with more planned. The additional choice of an affordable supermarket would have a wider community benefit as would the reduced need to travel outside of the area by car. The proposed development was also on an existing bus route, which would allow access via public transport. He considered that the impact on the Green Belt was limited although he recognised that it attracted substantial weight, and that the retail impact was also limited as well as harm from the impact on employment which was given limited weight based on the evidence in the Averson Young letter dated 29 August 2025. Other harms including landscape and visual impact could be acceptably mitigated via conditions. Taking all matters into consideration members judged that the benefits clearly and demonstrably outweighed the harm and established very special circumstances justifying the development in the Green Belt. It was acknowledged that the site was outside the settlement boundary, other than in accordance with the Town Centre hierarchy but it was judged that the very special circumstances were a material consideration justifying departure from the Development Plan.

One member asked for further clarification over the process of bringing back an application that had previously been determined at committee. The Legal Business Partner explained that the new recommendation to approve the application was as a result of the committee's previous decision at the September meeting. Members were advised that officers had considered additional representations made by objectors since the last meeting but there had not been a change in circumstances and no new issues were being raised. Officers were therefore not recommending that Members make a different decision but the options available to members were not restricted in any way.

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

77. Application P/HOU/2025/02570 - Anchor Paddock, Batchelors Lane, Holt, BH21 7DS

The Development Management Team Leader presented the application. Members were informed that an objection had been received from the Parish Council. The location of the site in the Green Belt was identified and an aerial photograph taken prior to demolition of buildings at neighbouring White Barn was shown. It was explained that the proposal related to unauthorised extensions to a dwelling at Anchor Paddock and the demolition of two lawful outbuildings, which were highlighted on the plans. It was advised that the Green Belt exception set out in the NPPF allowing proportionate extensions could not be relied upon due to the history of previous extensions to the dwelling, which had originally been a modest bungalow but had since been extended on several occasions.

The proposed plans were displayed and the proposals for consideration were highlighted, comprising a dormer, a replacement extension and a further extension to the rear. Members were advised that planning permission had previously been sought for development at the site but the application had been withdrawn. An enforcement notice had subsequently been served requiring the removal of the unlawful extensions. As the applicant had inadvertently forfeited the right to appeal, officers considered it appropriate to allow the applicant an opportunity to present their circumstances. Members were further advised that the applicant had signed up to a legal agreement securing the removal of the lawful outbuildings identified on the plans in return for permission being granted for the alterations to the main dwelling.

Photographs of the dwelling were shown, including views of the dormer from land to the north. It was noted that the property was screened from the highway and no design harm was identified that would justify refusal. The two outbuildings proposed for removal were identified and it was explained that their removal would open up the northern end of the site. Members were advised that permitted development rights would be removed so that express planning permission would be required for any future development. The presenting officer concluded that the very special circumstances, namely the secured removal of the outbuildings, justified the proposed development.

In response to questions from members the Development Management Team Leader confirmed that Class A and Class E Permitted Development rights would be removed from the site and that it was currently a single residential site although had been used for holiday accommodation in the past.

Several members expressed support for the application and noted the benefits of removing the outbuildings and consolidating the development on the site.

It was proposed by Cllr Coombs and seconded by Cllr Skeats that the application be granted.

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

78. Application P/FUL/2025/06049 - Corfe Castle Field, Hollands Close, Corfe Castle, BH20 5HE

The Development Management Team Leader presented the application, explaining that it had come before the committee because part of the site was located on land owned by Dorset Council. The site location was shown and it was noted that a portion of the site lay within the village settlement boundary, with a public right of way running alongside it. The whole site was situated within the National Landscape. Photographs were displayed to illustrate the context of the proposal and it was confirmed that the scale of development was considered proportionate.

It was reported that while some objectors were sceptical about the chosen location and the need for the equipment, officers considered the position to be sensible and appropriately located within the field. The proposal included outdoor gym equipment along with a new pedestrian access and gate. Proposed elevations were presented, showing the equipment set behind the existing fencing. It was advised that the proposal was not judged to harm the visual appearance of the area or the wider National Landscape. The equipment would be positioned away from the playing field and the visual impact of the rubber matting was expected to lessen over time as the surrounding grass grew through. It was noted that Condition 3 required the matting to be installed before first use. Concerns regarding drainage had been raised, but the site was not considered to be at risk from fluvial or surface water flooding.

Additional site photographs were shown to provide context in relation to neighbouring properties. Some objectors had expressed concerns about potential noise and anti-social behaviour, but officers advised that the nature of the equipment was not expected to result in significant changes to pedestrian or vehicle movements. It was also reported that some local residents had expressed support for the scheme. No additional parking provision was proposed and the site was described as easily accessible from the village.

Officers considered that the provision of the outdoor gym equipment was appropriate for the location and included inclusive equipment, the proposal was therefore considered acceptable.

A statement from the Ward Member, Cllr Ben Wilson, was read out by the Chair. He stated that the equipment that previously installed in a different area of the village had reached the end of its life and therefore new equipment had been proposed. The proposal would provide benefits to local residents and there had been no objections from the main local stakeholder groups. There had also been no noted incidents of anti-social behaviour when the equipment was installed in the previous location.

It was proposed by Cllr Skeats and seconded by Cllr Ezzard that the application be granted.

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

79. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

80. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 - 11.25 am

Chairman

.....