

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 20 MAY 2026

Present: Cllrs David Tooke (Chair), Duncan Sowry-House (Vice-Chair), Alex Brenton, Ray Bryan, Toni Coombs, Beryl Ezzard, Scott Florek, David Morgan, Julie Robinson, Andy Skeats and Gary Suttle

Apologies: Cllrs Hannah Hobbs-Chell

Other members present: Cllr Shane Bartlett

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

Elizabeth Adams (Development Management Team Leader), Lara Altree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), James Brightman (Senior Planning Officer), Kim Cowell (Development Management Area Manager (East)), Susan Hetherington (Transport Development Liaison Manager), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic and Governance Officer), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic & Governance Services Officer) and Thomas Whild (Lead Project Officer)

1. **Apologies**

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Hobbs-Chell.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Florek and Cllr Sowry-House declared an interest in application P/FUL/2025/06825 due to having made comments on the application as Ward Members, they left the room for the discussion and vote for this item.

3. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 April were confirmed and signed.

4. **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.

5. **P/FUL/2023/07270 - 12 Golf Links Road Ferndown BH22 8BY**

The Development Management Team Leader presented the application for the demolition of an existing dwelling and the erection of eight flats. A map of the town centre was shown with the application site and areas of Special Character identified.

The site context was illustrated through photographs showing the current condition of the land and surrounding area. It was explained that the proposed flats would be positioned at a similar distance from neighbouring properties as existing buildings. Attention was given to the relationship with Flat No. 14, where the proposal would impact the outlook from that property. It was considered necessary to require additional obscure glazing to certain proposed windows, up to a height of 1.7 metres, to protect privacy. The main impact identified would be a reduction in outlook from two flats. A rooflight at No. 14 was also proposed, and further obscure glazing to a height of 1.7 metres was proposed to prevent overlooking. The inclusion of a balcony and windows was addressed, with a screening solution proposed to avoid harmful overlooking.

Properties to the rear of the site, located on Ringwood Road, were described as chalet bungalows. The proposed three-storey building was acknowledged as having the potential to create overlooking; however, it was advised that the separation distances were sufficient to avoid unacceptable harm.

Flood risk was considered in light of updated National Planning Policy Framework guidance and new data received during the course of the application. The area was identified as having high groundwater levels, with the potential for shallow flooding of up to approximately 10 centimetres at the rear of the site. The site was not located on a flood flow path, and the predicted depths were considered modest. An indicative drainage plan had been requested and provided, demonstrating that flood risk could be managed through measures such as permeable paving. A sequential test was not considered necessary, as sufficient mitigation had been demonstrated.

Highway safety was also assessed. The proposed parking provision was in line with relevant guidelines. The road was described as relatively narrow, and existing on-street parking could result in a single lane of traffic, which had been raised as a concern by local residents. It was noted that congestion had occurred previously during construction works at No. 14 due to vehicles parking on the highway. A construction traffic management plan would therefore be required by condition. It was explained that parking on the highway was lawful, and any restrictions, such as double yellow lines, could be pursued separately by the Town Council if required.

In relation to habitats and biodiversity, the proposal included provision for a bat roost within the cycle store, and elevations showing this feature were presented. A temporary bat roost would also be provided during the construction phase.

The development would result in a net increase of seven dwellings, which carried significant weight given the current lack of a five-year housing land supply. It was also confirmed that there would be no substantial harm arising from any departure from the Special Character Area designation.

Public representation was received from Giles Moir, as the agent for the application. He stated that the scheme had been designed to reduce the bulk of the building and retain the appearance of a domestic property. He noted that the proposal was compliant with policy and met the minimum required separation

distances to neighbouring dwellings and that the Flood Risk Management team were satisfied that flood risk could be managed.

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

- The proposal was considered to meet intention of the guidance of the Special Character Area in terms of landscaping, scale, mass and height and ecology.
- Trees were proposed to be retained and there would be new boundary hedging included in the proposal.
- The flood risk assessment had identified some risk of flooding on the site up to a depth of 10cm, which the Flood Risk Engineer was satisfied could be effectively mitigated through a drainage scheme.
- Condition 5 required submission of a landscaping plan that would be agreed before any works above ground level.
- All 10 parking spaces on site would be unallocated.
- Condition 4 required a Construction Method Statement to be submitted, that would include how all vehicles would park, the agent expected that parking could take place of site, although there may still be some on-road parking.
- The plot size was 0.15ha and the amenity space would be partly private with some communal space.
- The bin store was proposed to be located at the front of the site and the Waste team were satisfied with this arrangement.
- The applicant had submitted an Ecological Impact Assessment and had determined that the roof of the cycle store would be an appropriate location for a bat roost.
- Condition 3 required the detailed submission of a Surface Water Management Plan, which would be checked with the Flood Risk Management Team.
- The site was located approximately 100m from the junction with Ringwood Road and was located on a 30mph road, so there were not concerns about highways safety and if parking on the road was causing issues, that could be explored separately.

Having had the opportunity to debate the merits of the application members expressed that many of the concerns that had been raised through the course of the debate had been addressed by officers.

It was proposed by Cllr Morgan and seconded by Cllr Robinson that the application be granted.

Decision: That authority be delegated to the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Eastern Area Development Management Area Manager to

- A) grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the appendix to these minutes and the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure New Forest Habitat Site mitigation.

Or

- B) Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the appendix to these minutes if the S106 agreement is not completed by 20 November 2026 or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Eastern Area Development Management Area Manager. The reasons for refusal for failure to secure the necessary obligations are set out in full in the appendix to these minutes.

6. P/FUL/2025/06825 - 168 Springdale Road Corfe Mullen BH21 3QN

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application for the change of use of an existing residential bungalow to a children's day nursery, including the erection of secure boundary fencing to the rear. It was explained that no external changes to the building were proposed. The site context was shown on a map, highlighting that the surrounding area was predominantly residential, with Upton Heath located approximately 35 metres to the south. Photographs illustrated the site and its setting, including a continuous hedge across the frontage.

Members were shown the proposed parking plan, which involved the removal of a short section of hedging to allow the access road to be widened. New hard surfacing was proposed, with parking spaces to be reserved for staff. Cycle storage was indicated to the east of the existing dwelling. An outdoor play area was also shown on the plan, located adjacent to a neighbouring property.

It was advised that the principle of the development was considered acceptable, as the site was located within a main settlement with access to services, facilities, and public transport. Highways safety concerns raised by Ward Members and members of the public were acknowledged. It was noted that approximately 75% of drop-off and pick-up times would be staggered, reducing the number of cars attending the site at one time. Allocated time slots for drop-off and collection would be implemented, and the nursery would encourage active travel. Visibility from the existing access was considered acceptable, and the Council's Highway Engineer had raised no objection. It was confirmed that a condition would be imposed requiring adherence to a submitted traffic management plan, and that the proposal was not expected to result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. It was further noted that the proposed new access would require an additional condition to ensure that the first five metres of the vehicular access were laid out and constructed before it was brought into use.

It was acknowledged that the site was located immediately adjacent to residential dwellings and that there would be some noise associated with the use of the outdoor play area and general use of the site. A noise impact assessment had been submitted, which concluded that, with mitigation, noise levels would remain within acceptable thresholds. Proposed mitigation measures included an acoustic fence at the rear of the site to reduce noise levels, staff-supervised play sessions with a maximum of ten children at any one time, and the absence of static play equipment. A complaint response procedure would be in place, and no amplified sound equipment would be used. The submitted noise management plan was

considered acceptable, subject to a condition requiring the nursery to operate in accordance with it.

In terms of the character of the area, it was noted that there would be some increased visibility of parking associated with the new access; however, this would generally be at a low level and would not result in significant harm. Overall, the proposal was considered to provide an early year's facility in a sustainable location.

Public representation was received from Aisla Wilson, who objected to the application on the grounds of highway safety. She noted that the road was hazardous and cars often exceeded the speed limit of the road creating a dangerous environment, which would be worsened by the proposal.

The applicant, Paul Spencer, spoke in support of the application. He stated that the current location of the nursery couldn't be expanded and a new facility was being sought within the catchment area. Noise mitigation would be achieved through acoustic fences, grass playing surfaces rather than concrete and staff supervision. In addition, all children would have left the premises by 18:00 and people leaving the nursery would be encouraged to turn left only to reduce traffic accessing the roundabout. Parking on the road would also be discouraged by the nursery.

Ward Members for Corfe Mullen, Cllr Sowry-House and Cllr Florek both spoke in objection to the application. They raised concerns with the application that included, highways safety, the impact on public transport, risk of harm to children attending the nursery, impacts on neighbouring amenity and the erosion of the residential character of the area.

Officers provided the following responses to questions from members:

- Noise mitigation measures would include an acoustic fence, supervision of children, a maximum of 10 children outside at once and no music or static play equipment. In addition, outdoor play would be restricted to certain hours in the morning and afternoon.
- If the scheme was approved, it would be unlikely that it could go back to residential use in the future due to the proximity to the heathland.
- If members were minded an informative note could be added encouraging the use of rubber crumb surfaces to reduce noise impact.
- Part of the hedging at the front of the site would be removed to widen the access to 6m.
- There would be strict staff to child ratios that would be adhered to.
- There was no boundary fencing proposed at the front of the site, however there would be fencing around the outdoor play area to keep children contained within the playground and the building itself.
- The wording of condition 9 could be amended to require the submission of full details of hard and soft landscaping works to include surfacing.
- The future second access was not considered necessary by Highways and had been proposed to be completed later due to cost constraints.
- Cars would be able to enter and exit the site in a forward gear.

Several members remained concerned about the access to the site and considered that the application would be safer if there were two accesses that would allow a one-way system to be utilised. Other members expressed that their concerns had been alleviated by the responses received to members questions.

It was proposed by Cllr Ezzard and seconded by Cllr Brenton, to grant the application as per the officer's recommendation, including the updated wording of condition 12 and the amendment to the wording of condition 9 requiring the submission of landscaping works.

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

7. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

8. Exempt Business

There was no exempt business.

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 12.12 pm

Chairman

.....