

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 11 MARCH 2026

Present: Cllrs David Tooke (Chair), Duncan Sowry-House (Vice-Chair), Alex Brenton, Toni Coombs, Beryl Ezzard, Scott Florek, Spencer Flower, David Morgan and Julie Robinson

Apologies: Cllrs Barry Goringe, Hannah Hobbs-Chell and Andy Skeats

Also present: Cllr Shane Bartlett

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

Marianne Ashworth (Lawyer - Regulatory), Kim Cowell (Development Management Area Manager (East)), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer), Emma MacDonald (Planning Officer), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic & Governance Services Officer), Naomi Shinkins (Lead Project Officer) and Thomas Whild (Lead Project Officer)

92. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Brenton declared that application P/FUL/2022/01095 was located in her ward, however she was not pre-determined.

93. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2026 were confirmed and signed.

94. 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.

95. P/FUL/2022/01095 - Land at Blaneys Corner, To the east of Wareham Road and south of Wimborne Road. Lytchett Matravers

The Lead Project Officer presented the application for the erection of 25 dwellings with new vehicular and pedestrian access and associated works. An update was provided at the outset, clarifying that the CIL receipt was £497,000 and that public open space would be secured through a Section 106 agreement rather than by planning condition. It was also noted that the smaller apartment block proposed included one one-bedroom flat and one two-bedroom flat.

The site location within Lytchett Matravers was shown, including an aerial photograph illustrating the full extent of the application site. The land lay south of

Wimborne Road and was situated between both older and more recent developments. Site constraints were identified, including falling land levels. Photographs from various viewpoints were presented, including a view from the southwestern corner of the site and a street-view image from Wimborne Road.

It was explained that the site was allocated under Policy H6, which covered three separate sites, one of which (the Wareham Road site) had already been granted planning permission. A timeline of the application was provided.

The proposed masterplan was shown, including the design concept with an arrival area incorporating public open space and drainage at the eastern end of the site. Land-use areas were defined for residential development and public open space. The proposal comprised 25 dwellings with a housing mix ranging from a one-bedroom flat to four-bedroom houses, and 0.5 hectares of open space. Examples of the house designs were displayed, along with an indicative rendering of the overall development. Members were informed that 75 objections had been received and that both the Parish Council and the Housing Officer had raised objections.

On the principle of development, the Lead Project Officer explained that the proposal was acceptable because it was located on an allocated housing site and Policy H6 indicated that approximately 25 homes were appropriate. Policy V2 concerns were addressed, with it being explained that although the site had previously lain within the Green Belt, the Local Plan adoption had amended the boundaries. A small part of the site, containing only the SUDS attenuation basin, remained within the Green Belt, but this was not considered inappropriate development. The proposed housing mix varied from Local Plan recommendations but was considered acceptable.

It was explained that the policy-compliant requirement was for 10 affordable homes on site. The applicant had submitted a viability assessment, citing increased CIL costs and the costs of achieving nutrient neutrality in Poole Harbour. The District Valuer had reviewed the assessment and advised that the scheme was not viable if required to provide a fully compliant level of contributions. As a result, the scheme could not support any Section 106 contributions.

On highways matters, the proposed vehicular access would be provided via a new priority junction, with a secondary pedestrian access also proposed. The applicant had revised the junction design, narrowing the corner to help reduce vehicle speeds. Dorset Council Highways raised no objections. Parking provision included 57 allocated spaces, 18 garage spaces, and five on-street visitor spaces, with capacity for additional informal on-street parking if required. The overall parking level was considered acceptable.

The site layout included public open space at the entrance, with dwellings arranged to front the access road and set back with landscaped gardens. The scale and layout were considered acceptable, and the variety of house types created visual interest. The design incorporated predominantly pitched and gable roofs and a varied material palette including brick, painted brick, slate roofs and some cladding. Although the Parish Council had expressed concern over the use

of brick and flint, officers considered these materials appropriate given their presence elsewhere in the village.

A large number of trees existed around the site boundary. Three areas were subject to TPOs and the Tree Officer confirmed that the trees could be protected subject to conditions. Permitted development rights were proposed to be removed for some dwellings to protect trees in the long term.

Regarding residential amenity, officers concluded that the development would not cause sufficient harm to justify refusal. The closest relationship was a 12-metre distance to an adjacent block of flats which had no windows on the facing elevation, preventing overlooking. A condition restricting construction working hours was considered included in the recommendation.

The drainage strategy proposed discharge to a watercourse via an attenuation basin. As the site lay in flood zone 1, drainage was considered acceptable and had been reviewed by the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Officer confirmed that biodiversity net gain was not required, but the scheme included several ecological enhancements and was acceptable subject to conditions. The site lay within 5 km of the Dorset Heathlands, but mitigation measures and the presence of a SANG to the north were sufficient to address potential impacts. Nutrient neutrality could be achieved through the purchase of credits.

Public representation was received from Clare Spiller, the agent for the application. It was explained that the applicant had worked with officers to provide an acceptable scheme, that would provide a variety of house types with safe vehicle and pedestrian access.

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

- There was no proposed connection from the proposed footpath to the existing rights of way and there was no policy requirement for a connection.
- Footpaths would connect into the site and tactile paving was proposed on either side of the road.
- The impact of the proposal on Myrtle Cottage had been considered in the report and it was not deemed to be sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal.
- The SANG was located approximately 420m away, which equated to a 4-minute walk.
- The Purbeck Local Plan was part of the development plan and was given weight in the consideration of the application.
- The exact figure that the applicant paid for the land was not known, the District Valuer had taken the lowest reasonable value that a landowner would accept for the land, in addition to other factors such as the topography of the site to estimate the value of the land.
- The land that the adjacent footpath was situated on was in different ownership to the application site.
- The Parish Council maintained their concerns to the amended proposal.
- The ridge height of the proposed block of flats was 8.7m and the eave height was 5.2m. An assessment on the impact of overshadowing on Myrtle Cottage was carried out and it was determined that it would not be harmful.
- An uncontrolled crossing was considered appropriate for the level of footfall generated from the proposed development.
- It was not possible to condition an additional footpath as it would be on land outside of the applicants ownership.

- It was not possible to condition a viability review, as there was no policy in the Local Plan that supported a viability review.

It was proposed by Cllr Coombs and seconded by Cllr Sowry-House, that the application be granted, with an additional informative note encouraging the linking of the new footpath to the existing footpath in the future if possible.

Decision:

That authority be delegated to the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement and Development Management Area Manager East to

- A) grant, subject to the completion of a 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:
 - a Scheme for the provision and promotion of Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANG)
 - provision of public open space

And the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

Or

- B) refused for the reason set out in the appendix to these minutes if the agreement is not completed by 11 September 2026, or such extended time as agreed by the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or Development Management Area Manager East.

96. P/FUL/2025/06295 - 10 Weston Road Colehill BH21 2SF

The Planning Officer presented the application for a single-storey rear extension and bin store, together with the demolition of the existing garage and conservatory, and the change of use of the residential property to a pharmacy (Class E).

The application site was shown, located across the road from the existing pharmacy. It was explained that the site lay on a minor road characterised by detached single-storey or chalet style bungalows, while the current pharmacy operated from a terrace of commercial properties nearby.

The application site consisted of a residential bungalow accessed from Weston Road. Photographs were displayed showing the property attached to No. 9 Weston Road, with an open frontage, driveway and garage. A photograph taken from Middlehill Road illustrated the character of the area and the proximity of the existing pharmacy.

The proposed development was outlined and the site plan presented. Elevation drawings showed the front and side aspects of the proposed extension. It was noted that although the scheme would result in the loss of one dwelling, this was not considered to be a significant loss. The proposed pharmacy would serve the same catchment area and provide the same NHS facilities as the existing one.

The site lay within the Colehill settlement boundary and as the proposal did not involve a town centre use, no sequential test was required.

Amenity impacts were highlighted as a key concern. Objections had been raised by neighbours and the Town Council. It was explained that the proposal would introduce frequent short-stay customer visits, increasing the number of vehicle movements and parking demand. Weston Road was described as a small cul-de-sac used only by residents and their visitors, and the level of activity associated with a pharmacy was likely to exceed what could reasonably be expected in such a location. This was judged to negatively affect the amenity of residents. Additional features such as alarm boxes, CCTV and deliveries were also identified as potential sources of disturbance to neighbouring occupiers. It was considered that the activity pattern generated by the proposed use would be materially different from that of the existing residential setting.

The impact on the character of the area was assessed and it was considered that the proposed extension would increase the footprint of the property bringing it almost up to the boundary with 27 Middlehill Road, contrasting with the typical plot characteristics of the area, where dwellings were well spaced on generous plots. The inclusion of large display-style windows and an expanded hardstanding area for parking would alter the appearance of what was currently a wholly residential street scene.

In regard to highways and parking, both on-site parking and parking on Middlehill Road were available, Dorset Highways had confirmed that the proposal would not give rise to material harm to highway safety and complied with current guidance. Limited on-site parking was noted to be common for pharmacies, which were recognised as important community facilities.

The Planning Officer concluded that the proposal would result in harmful impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and therefore conflicted with Policy HE2 of the Local Plan. No public benefits had been identified that would outweigh this harm, and the application was recommended for refusal.

Public representation was received in objection to the application from Charlotte Collins, Daryll Howells and Paul Ellard. The concerns that were raised included the change in character of the road that the development would cause, the increased traffic movements on the road and use of the road as parking and an increase in noise and light pollution. It was also questioned whether an alternative location could be found for the pharmacy or whether the current location could be extended.

Public representation in support of the application was received from KD Johnson and the applicant, Mitesh Patel. They explained that it was important to keep the pharmacy in the same location to continue to provide the same services to residents. The new development would allow for the pharmacy to meet the growing demands of the area. The applicant explained that they had looked into alternative sites in the area and not found any other suitable options.

The Planning Officer clarified that Highways had not objected to the application and were content with the impact on highways and the parking provision provided

in the proposal. It was also explained that a drainage scheme was not required at this stage of the application as the site was not at risk of flooding.

The following answers were provided by officers, in response to questions from members:

- The proposal included provision of 7 parking spaces, 3 for staff and 4 for customers. There was a lay-by and small car park shared by other commercial businesses that served the existing pharmacy.
- Conditions could be included to limit operating hours and lighting if the committee were to approve the application.
- The Town Council could request additional parking restrictions on Weston Road if they wanted to control parking on that road.
- There was not considered to be a significant adverse impact of the development on 27 Middlehill Road.

Having had the opportunity to debate the merits of the application, several members expressed support for the application, given the understanding that the current premises was not fit for use and that the new premises would allow the pharmacy to continue to meet the needs of the community.

It was proposed by Cllr Coombs and seconded by Cllr Sowry-House that the application be granted subject to conditions to include: submitted plans; commencement of the development within 3 years of granting permission; surface water drainage; plans for turning, manoeuvring and parking to be submitted in advance; restrictions on hours of operation and deliveries; restrictions on signage and exterior lighting; use Class E restriction; provision of an ecological impact assessment; CIL contributions; tree and landscaping conditions, the details of which were to be delegated to officers.

Decision: That the application be granted subject to conditions, the full details of which were to be delegated to officers.

97. P/FUL/2025/06017 - 50-51 Churchill Close, Sturminster Marshall, BH21 4BH

The Lead Project Officer presented the application for the demolition of a garage and outbuilding and the erection of two two-bedroom bungalows with associated parking, together with the creation of new parking areas for Nos. 50 and 51. An update was provided advising that, since publication of the committee papers, an additional representation had been received from residents of Newton Road raising concerns about increased flood risk from the proposal.

The site context within Sturminster Marshall was shown, including the application site and adjoining garages. Neighbourhood Plan policies' recognition of the distinctive character of the area were highlighted. A street-scene view from the recreation ground was presented, identifying the garage to be demolished. The proposed new access would run between No. 51 and the existing garage. It was considered that single-storey development could be achieved without harming the established character of the area.

The design of the proposed bungalows was shown and described as using traditional materials. Reference was made to a previous appeal in the vicinity where back land development had been allowed, with the Planning Inspector

acknowledging the area's varied character. A previous planning application on this site had been refused; the new proposal had amended the access position and moved Unit 2 further forward in its plot. Members were also informed that planning permission had previously been granted to create an additional dwelling on the plot of No 51, which could not be implemented should the new scheme be approved.

Concerns had been raised regarding neighbouring amenity. However, as the proposed dwellings were single storey with pitched roofs, officers considered they would not result in unacceptable impacts. Photographs of rear gardens were shown, demonstrating limited visibility. The presence of obscure-glazed windows in facing elevations was noted and the removal of permitted development rights for roof alterations was proposed.

The Lead Project Officer explained that the creation of new parking spaces would lead to some loss of off-street parking, but this was not regarded as significant. Flood risk concerns had also been raised. Flood zone mapping for the wider area was shown, and it was confirmed that the application site itself was not identified as being at risk of flooding. The development would incorporate permeable paving and a soakaway chamber to manage surface water. It was noted that the Council could not demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and that the tilted balance therefore applied.

Public representation was received in objection to the application from Tim Weaver, Sue Eaton and Cllr Helen Fookes, representing Sturminster Parish Council. The objections to the application included the overdevelopment of the area, which would impact the character of the road and worsen flooding issues on Newton Road and that the proposed bungalows would be out of keeping with the existing semi-detached properties in the area.

David McDonald, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He noted that he would also be the builder of the development and would therefore ensure that the building work did not significantly impact the neighbours by controlling times of working, deliveries and parking.

The Lead Project Officer clarified that the previous application on the site was refused for the amenity impacts on future occupiers rather than any impacts on neighbouring properties and that the application site was outside of the flood risk area.

In response to members questions the Lead Project Officer confirmed that the inability to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply was a material consideration in the application. In addition, it was proposed in the recommendation that Permitted Development Rights be removed from the bungalows, to prevent any further extensions into the roof space.

It was proposed by Cllr Flower and seconded by Cllr Brenton that the application be granted.

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

98. **P/VOC/2025/07020 - Quarterjack Park Development, Leigh Road, Wimborne Minster, BH21 2DA**

The Committee agreed to extend the meeting beyond 3 hours.

The Lead Project Officer presented the application for a variation of Condition 1 of the previously approved reserved matters application, seeking to revise landscaping details relating to trees and drainage. The application was retrospective and the Town Council had raised an objection. An update was provided to advise that the recommendation had been amended, as the landscape ecological management plan would be difficult to enforce via condition given the retrospective nature of the proposal, the applicants were therefore required to enter into a S106 planning obligation to secure delivery.

Slides were shown identifying the application site in relation to Wimborne and Colehill, along with a photograph of the site as built. The site plan for Phase 1 of the development was presented, with the trees proposed for amendment marked on the plan. It was noted that Phase 2 had been approved under a separate application.

A site plan illustrating the drainage layout was also shown. The site history was outlined, it was explained that the land formed part of allocation WMC8, and the relevant policy was displayed. The outline planning application had included a parameter plan, and reserved matters were approved in 2019 and amended in 2022 to allow an uplift of 18 dwellings. A further additional dwelling had been approved in 2022. Phase 2 had been approved in 2020. It was noted that a previous proposal for SUDS on the western side of the site had been refused due to insufficient drainage information.

The Lead Project Officer outlined the proposed development, comparing the approved reserved matters scheme with the revised SUDS layout. The proposed tree species were shown. Concerns had been raised through objections to both the previously refused application and a withdrawn application.

Although the application sought to vary landscaping plans, the Lead Project Officer advised that it was not unusual for SUDS features to be located within open space, nor for tree species to be amended. The impact on local character was considered acceptable, as only two trees would be affected and the proposed species were consistent with the area's character.

It was explained that the SUDS area would remain undeveloped green space providing visual amenity and substantial open space for residents. The development also benefitted from access to the Phase 2 open spaces and the SANG located to the south.

The Tree Officer had confirmed that the proposed species were appropriate but preferred a non-fastigate variety and it was considered that the changes would not impact the character of the area. Although some concern had been expressed regarding the health of an existing tree, no issues had been identified. There were

no changes proposed to the highway network, and Dorset Council Highways had raised no objections to the previously withdrawn application.

Drainage had been a key issue in the earlier refusal; however, the Officer explained that the submission of detailed drainage information could overcome the previous reason for refusal. Drainage engineers had reviewed the current approach. Some Phase 1 plots were already connected, and the proposed drainage would run north-south, with surface water from Phase 2 redirected to the SUDS. The pumping station in Phase 2 had been designed to accommodate runoff from both phases, and the arrangement was considered acceptable. Conditions from the earlier permission had been transferred over where appropriate, and these were set out on the slide presented to members.

In response to a question, the Lead Project Officer confirmed that the proposed SUDS to the west were shallower than the SUDS to the north of the site.

It was proposed by Cllr Coombs and seconded by Cllr Flower to grant the application.

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

99. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

100. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 1.14 pm

Chairman

.....