

WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 29 JANUARY 2026

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

Apologies: Cllrs Belinda Bawden and Kate Wheller

Also present: Cllr Shane Barlett

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

Ann Collins (Area Manager – Western and Southern Team), Alison Curtis, Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), James Lytton-Trevers (Lead Project Officer), Hannah Massey (Lawyer - Regulatory), Robert Parr (Planning Officer), Steven Tapscott (Senior Planning Officer), Eve Van der Steen (Senior Conservation and Design Officer) and Louis Wicks (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice)

51. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Kate Wheller and Cllr Belinda Bawden joined the meeting online.

52. Declarations of Interest

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

Cllr Bolwell declared that he was the Ward Member for Bridport and was aware of application P/MPO/2025/06054, however did not consider himself predetermined on the application and took part in the discussion and vote for that item.

53. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2025 were confirmed and signed.

54. 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.

55. **P/MPO/2025/06054 - Land at Vearse Farm (Foundry Lea), Bridport, DT6 5JT**

The Lead Project Officer presented the draft plans of the roundabout to the committee, and the proposal was explained in relation to an application to alter a condition to allow dwellings to be occupied prior to the construction of the roundabout. Members were advised that a legal restriction currently prevented any occupation of the dwellings until the roundabout had been completed.

It was explained that the applicant fully intended to construct the roundabout but sought a variation to the legal agreement to allow 109 of the houses to be occupied beforehand.

It was noted that the restriction had been imposed at the outline planning permission stage. National Highways were identified as the principal consultee, and both National Highways and Dorset Council Highways had been consulted on the application. They advised that up to 109 dwellings could be safely occupied before the roundabout was completed.

The wording of the relevant clause within the legal agreement was displayed and the proposed change was described as an amendment to allow occupation of no more than 109 dwellings before the completion of the Miles Cross roundabout. A breakdown of the 109 dwellings was provided, showing that 76 of them would be affordable homes. Dorset Highways raised no objection to the proposed level of early occupation.

Mr Bates and Cllr Hartman, Symondsburry Parish Council, spoke in opposition to the application. They raised concerns about the delay of the construction of the Miles Cross Roundabout and the potential public safety implications of occupying dwellings before the work was completed. They also noted that the public benefit of the application was limited and that there were concerns from local residents and the Parish Council.

Mr Hawkins, representing the applicant and Mr Winchester spoke in support of the application. They noted that 76 of the 109 homes that would be occupied would be affordable homes and so there was a clear benefit in addressing the housing shortage in Dorset and that no material harm would be caused by the application.

In response to members questions the Lead Project Officer and Development Team Leader explained that the roundabout would likely take 9 months to complete given the size of the project and that National Highways had identified a window in which the work could be carried out.

Members had the opportunity to debate the merits of the application. Members noted the concerns raised by the local residents and the Parish Council about the delay in completing the roundabout, however also understood that the advice provided by National Highways and Dorset Council Highways was that 109 dwellings could be safely occupied, while also recognising the benefit of 76 affordable homes.

The Development Management Area Manager clarified that if the applicant breached the planning permission in the future then an enforcement case could be opened against them, however the applicant could choose to make a new application in the future if they wished.

It was proposed by Cllr Bell and seconded by Cllr Northam to grant the application as per the recommendation in the report.

Decision:

A) That the application be granted, subject to the completion of a deed of variation of the 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:

- Amendment to the wording of Schedule 3, Part 16, para. 17.2 to read: *“Not to permit the Occupation of more than 109 dwellings until the completion of the Miles Cross Junction works.”*

B) Refuse permission for the reason set out in the appendix to these minutes if the agreement is not completed by 30th April 2026 or such extended time as agreed in writing by the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement.

56. **P/FUL/2025/05407 - 5A Surrey Close, Granby Industrial Estate, Chickerell, DT9 9TY**

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application for the change of use of land for the siting of 34 storage containers and associated works. The site location and plan were shown, identifying the site within the Granby industrial estate.

Members were informed that the land was owned by Dorset Council, lay within the Defined Development Boundary, and formed part of the safeguarded key employment site at the Granby. The site had originally gained permission for use as a car park in 1986. Photographs were shown to illustrate the existing character of the site and the surrounding industrial estate. Various views from around the site were presented, including nearby buildings. It was explained that some negotiation had taken place during the application process and the changes were identified on the site plan.

Plans of the proposed storage containers were shown, along with existing and proposed cycle store plans. The existing and proposed street scenes were also presented, demonstrating that the containers and fencing would be screened by planting.

In considering the planning issues, it was stated that the principle of development was acceptable because the site lay within both the DDB and a designated Key Employment Site, where B8 storage and distribution uses were supported. The scale, design and impact on local character were assessed, and it was noted that the containers would not be visually intrusive and were appropriate to the setting.

The type of fencing proposed, including palisade or similar styles, would be acceptable if set back and screened.

In terms of neighbouring amenity, the nearest residential property was approximately 240 metres away. It was therefore unlikely that workers or residents would experience disturbance and Environmental Protection had raised no concerns. Flood risk and drainage matters were addressed, with surface water flood risk identified on the constraints map; however, it was explained that the proposed use was classified as less vulnerable in flood risk terms, and the development would not materially alter drainage.

In terms of Highways impacts, policy required that development should not be permitted if it would have a severe detrimental impact on road safety or if such impacts could not be reasonably mitigated. Concerns remained regarding visibility splays and access for emergency vehicles. Photographs showed cars parked along Surrey Close to the extent that two vehicles would struggle to pass, and it was suggested that two HGVs meeting on the road would present difficulties. The Senior Planning Officer highlighted that the applicant had provided no information on business hours, no details about a booking system, and insufficient clarity in the submitted swept path analysis, including what vehicle type had been used for the assessment. The planning agent had indicated that HGV movements would be minimal but did not rule them out and suggested that HGVs could turn in the nearby industrial park car park; however, the land wasn't included within the boundaries of the application site. There would also be a loss of parking from the proposed development and an objection had been received from a neighbouring business regarding this loss. Officers concluded that the impact on highway safety was unacceptable and contrary to policy.

In relation to ecology, the Senior Planning Officer referred to Policy ENV2, which required any harm to nature conservation interests to be mitigated or compensated and to Neighbourhood Plan Policy CNP12, which required a biodiversity plan. The applicant had stated that the scheme would cause no ecological harm, but officers advised that photographs showed existing scrub that would need to be cleared, and fencing might not be able to be installed without damaging vegetation. Biodiversity net gain would be required where more than 25 square metres of habitat was lost; officers believed this applied, although the applicant disagreed and had provided no evidence to support their position. Members were advised that biodiversity net gain was a post-permission matter and could not form a reason for refusal. The site also lay within 5 km of the Chesil and the Fleet Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

In presenting the planning balance, it was explained that the proposal was contrary to the adopted development plan. Although the change of use would provide an economic benefit, the uncertainty regarding the impact on nearby businesses arising from the loss of parking and the failure to demonstrate safe highway conditions carried significant weight against any identified benefits.

On behalf of the applicant, Mr Annen addressed the committee. He acknowledged that the principle of development was acceptable and stated that the proposal was also acceptable in terms of scale, design and neighbouring amenity. He noted that the applicant held a long lease from the Council and owned land and a building to

the north, which he argued could be used by HGVs for turning. He stated that HGV deliveries were unlikely as the containers were small and would typically be used by individuals arriving in cars or vans for household or small-business storage. He also suggested that the applicant could carry out routine maintenance to manage overgrown vegetation on the site, without the need for a biodiversity plan.

The following responses were provided by officers in response to members questions:

- A detailed swept path analysis had not been provided by the applicant.
- If there was a change in use of the land to B8, then other types of storage businesses could be operated on site in the future.
- The applicant stated that they owned the land to the north of the site, however this was not included in the application site.
- Permission was granted for the site in 1986 for offices and ancillary parking.

Having had the chance to debate the merits of the application, one member had expressed support for the scheme and noted the benefits of rejuvenating the area and also viewed any potential highways issues as minimal. However, other members expressed concerns about the lack of information for the swept path analysis and loss of parking.

It was proposed by Cllr Northam and seconded by Cllr Christopher that the application be deferred to allow the applicant to submit the relevant information in regards to highways and ecology concerns.

The Development Management Area Manager advised members that the Council could be at risk of non-determination if a decision wasn't made and that there could be costs to the Council involved with that.

The proposal was withdrawn by Cllr Northam in light of the advice given by officers.

It was proposed by Cllr Eysenck and seconded by Cllr Kimber, that the application refused.

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

57. P/LBC/2025/05844 - Lyme Regis Harbour, The Cobb, Lyme Regis, DT7 3JJ

Cllr O'Leary left the meeting at 12:08.

The Conservation and Design Officer presented the application to repair the void under The Cobb in Lyme Regis. Site location plans were shown and it was explained that the site relates to Dorset Council owned land. The structure was Grade I listed and within the Lyme Regis Conservation Area.

The committee was shown an aerial photograph of the site, and the officer explained that the structure formed part of The Cobb, a historic defence feature

and the area of the application was thought to date from 18th–19th century repair works. The highlighted area on the plan identified the section where deep voiding had occurred and where repair works were proposed.

Members were advised that the proposal sought to carry out a stopgap repair to stabilise this part of The Cobb while the Lyme Regis Improvement Scheme Phase 5 progressed through its necessary stages. The scaffold required for the work would be weighted down rather than fixed to the structure to avoid any physical impact on the historic fabric.

It was explained that the damaged concrete would be repaired in situ and that the infill of the large void beneath The Cobb would provide localised stabilisation of the structure. Lyme Regis Town Council had indicated support for the application.

It was confirmed that the proposed works would not result in harm to the listed structure and would not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Members were supportive of the application and understood the need to carry out the repair works.

It was proposed by Cllr Bell and seconded by Cllr Monks to grant the application.

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

58. **P/FUL/2025/02894 - Kika Beach Club, 52-53 The Esplanade, Weymouth, DT4 8DG**

The Planning Officer presented both applications P/FUL/2025/02894 and P/LBC/2025/02899 at the same time as they related to the same premises. The scheme sought the retention of canopies and associated works to the frontage of the Kika Beach Club for use within the business premises.

Members were shown the site, which fronted onto the esplanade and comprised two mid-terrace Grade II listed buildings together with a section of the highway pavement in front. The premises operated as a drinking establishment and restaurant. The site lay within the Defined Development Boundary, the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area, and was part of a group of listed buildings.

An external floor plan was displayed, indicating the boundary formed by a timber-clad and metal-framed wall, with pedestrian access directly onto the pavement. The Planning Officer described the fixed polycarbonate canopy and two retractable canopies, under which benches and seating were positioned. The north elevation plans showed the structures in relation to the pavement area. Street-view images illustrated the frames with the canopies retracted. A closer image of the entrance was provided. A photograph dated December 2025 showed the canopies and infill plastic glazing in place, resulting in the complete obscuring

of the ground floor of the listed buildings. A comparison image from October 2009 was shown, illustrating the buildings prior to the installation of any external works.

The Planning Officer outlined the key planning considerations. While the principle of development was acceptable, the design was considered non-traditional and out of keeping with the Georgian architectural character of the area. The structures were judged to be at odds with the defining characteristics of the Conservation Area. It was considered that the works obscured the entire ground floor of the listed buildings and created visual clutter. Although the buildings had remained largely unaltered on their principal elevations, the visual integrity of the listed buildings had been adversely impacted. The proposal was considered to result in less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of the listed buildings, and no clear or convincing justification had been provided. It was noted that any public benefits arising from the outdoor seating could be achieved through temporary, non-permanent seating arrangements.

Officers provided the following responses to members questions:

- The current structure did not have planning permission and it was estimated that it had been installed gradually over the last 4-5 years.
- Establishments along the esplanade had been granted a sitting out licence, which allowed them to use temporary furniture to provide an outside seating area, rather than a permanent structure.

The committee agreed to extend the meeting beyond three hours.

Several members expressed sympathy for the local businesses and emphasised the importance of supporting them, however recognised the status of the Grade II listed buildings and their contribution to the setting and character of Weymouth.

It was proposed by Cllr Eysenck and seconded by Cllr Kimber that the application be refused.

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

59. P/LBC/2025/02899 - Kika Beach Club, 52-53 The Esplanade, Weymouth, DT4 8DG

It was proposed by Cllr Eysenck and seconded by Cllr Bolwell that the application be refused.

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

60. P/FUL/2025/01316 - 54-55 The Esplanade, Weymouth, DT4 8DG

The application was withdrawn.

61. P/LBC/2025/01317 - 54-55 The Esplanade, Weymouth, DT4 8DG

This application was withdrawn.

62. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

63. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 12.54 pm

Chairman

.....