

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 24 JUNE 2026

Present: Cllrs David Tooke (Chair), Duncan Sowry-House (Vice-Chair), Alex Brenton, Ray Bryan, Scott Florek, David Morgan and Andy Skeats

Apologies: Cllrs Toni Coombs, Beryl Ezzard, Hannah Hobbs-Chell, Julie Robinson and Gary Suttle

Also present: Cllrs Shane Bartlett and Ben Wilson (online)

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), Alison Curtis (Development Team Leader, Highways), Claire Hicks (Planning Officer), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic and Governance Officer), Emma MacDonald (Planning Officer), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic & Governance Services Officer), Thomas Stonell (Engineer) and Thomas Whild (Lead Project Officer)

9. Apologies

There were apologies for absence received from Cllrs Toni Coombs, Beryl Ezzard, Julie Robinson, Gary Suttle and Hannah Hobbs-Chell.

10. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Brenton declared that 2 of the applications were located in her ward, however she was not pre-determined on these applications.

11. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2026 were confirmed and signed.

12. 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.

13. P/FUL/2025/03733 – Land at Flowers Drove, Lytchett Matravers, Dorset

The Lead Project Officer presented the application for residential development in Lytchett Matravers. The site was identified on a map of the area, with a wooded

area noted along the northern boundary. It was explained that Policy H6 of the Local Plan allocated the site for development of approximately 30 dwellings.

The proposed masterplan was shown, indicating the delivery of 29 units. Photographs were provided, including views from various points around the site and views looking west towards Flowers Drove. A plan illustrating the topography of the site was also presented, along with a site layout showing the proposed mix of housing. Street scene drawings were displayed to demonstrate the design and types of dwellings proposed.

Members were advised that 23 objections had been received from members of the public. No objections had been raised by statutory consultees; however, objections had been received from the Parish Council and the Housing Officer in relation to the lack of affordable housing provision. It was clarified that concerns relating to inappropriate development in the Green Belt under Policy V2 were not applicable, as the policy had been amended and no part of the site fell within the Green Belt.

In respect of housing mix, the proposal was acknowledged to conflict with Policy H9, as it included a higher proportion of larger dwellings and fewer smaller units than required. Regarding affordable housing, it was reported that a policy-compliant scheme would normally deliver 11 affordable units on site, together with a financial contribution. However, the applicant had demonstrated that, due to increased construction costs and the cost of achieving nutrient neutrality in Poole Harbour, the scheme could not viably deliver affordable housing. The District Valuer Service had independently reviewed the viability assessment and identified some differences in approach but ultimately agreed that a fully policy-compliant scheme would not be viable. It was concluded that the maximum viable financial contribution the scheme could support was £369,642, and the applicant had agreed to this figure.

An image was provided showing the proposed vehicular access, which would connect to the existing pedestrian footway. In addition to the main vehicular access, a secondary pedestrian access was proposed. It was explained that off-site alterations to the junction of Wimborne Road, Wareham Road and Lime Kiln Road would be secured, along with an approved scheme to the south, to ensure delivery even if the other scheme did not proceed. A total of 58 allocated parking spaces were proposed, comprising a combination of driveways and parking courts, along with 18 garage spaces and six on-street visitor parking spaces. It was noted that there would also be capacity for informal on-street parking.

The scale, layout and character of the development were outlined, with all dwellings proposed at two storeys in height. A higher density of development was proposed at the entrance to the site, with lower density housing further into the site. An attenuation basin was proposed to the east of Flowers Drove. The dwellings would be predominantly constructed in brick, with some use of painted brick and flint.

A landscaping masterplan had been submitted and was supported by the Council's Landscape Officers. Proposals included feature boundary planting and the removal of a section of hedgerow to facilitate access. It was noted that there were a large number of trees along the site boundaries, and that a Tree

Preservation Order had been made in respect of one tree on the site in response to the application. The Tree Officer was satisfied that all trees could be adequately protected, subject to conditions. Boundary treatments would include a mix of hedging, fencing and brick walls at public-facing rear boundaries.

In relation to residential amenity, concerns regarding overlooking were acknowledged. A full assessment had been undertaken, which concluded that there would not be sufficient harm to justify refusal of the application. The closest separation distance between properties was noted to be 15.3 metres and the orientation of the dwellings would mean that views would not be direct.

Drainage arrangements were explained, with surface water proposed to discharge to a ditch to the north of the site via an attenuation pond. The Lead Local Flood Authority had reviewed the proposals and confirmed that they would not increase flood risk elsewhere. Wessex Water had also confirmed that there was capacity within the foul sewer network.

In terms of ecology and habitats, the proposal was confirmed to be biodiversity net gain compliant. The site lay within 5 kilometres of the Dorset Heathlands, and an appropriate assessment had been undertaken, demonstrating that mitigation could be achieved. This would include the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and nutrient neutrality through the purchase of credits.

Officers concluded that, on balance, the proposal was acceptable. It was further noted that, due to the Council's lack of a five-year housing land supply, the conflict relating to housing mix was not considered to carry sufficient weight to justify refusal of planning permission.

Public representation was received in support of the application from Brett Spiller, the agent for the application. He stated that there had been many challenges to the scheme, which had impacted its viability. However, the scheme was compliant with policy H6 and would provide 29 additional much needed homes in a sustainable location.

Officers provided the following responses to questions from members:

- Policies within the Local Plan and nationally allow for viability to be reviewed and the applicant and District Valuer had come to the conclusion that the scheme could not support on site provision of affordable housing.
- The application would be liable for the full level of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 legal agreement to secure necessary financial contributions and provision of open space and SANG.
- The road layout was constrained by the changes in levels across the site, meaning a circular route through the site was not possible.
- It was not considered appropriate to join the top of the footpath to Flowers Drove as it would require the removal of a large portion of hedgerow and it was not considered necessary to make the development acceptable as there was an alternative safer route to access the SANG.
- The chimneys of the dwellings were decorative and not functional.
- Renewables such as solar panels and air-source heat pumps were not required for planning purposes, however building regulations would require the dwellings to be built to standard of energy efficiency.
- It was considered that the scheme provided an appropriate drainage solution through a proposed attenuation pond and connection to an existing ditch.

- CIL payments would be used to meet the demands resulting from the development.
- It was not considered that there was sufficient demand to justify a controlled crossing.
- A condition was included requiring the full details of the surface water management scheme to be submitted.
- Should a change of speed limit of Flowers Drove be seen as necessary, the Parish Council could seek to reduce the speed limit in the future.

It was proposed by Cllr Sowry-House and seconded by Cllr Morgan, 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 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 the following:
- an Affordable Housing Contribution of £133,043.00 Index Linked index-linked using RPI from the date of this committee report, in lieu of on-site provision
 - Financial contributions of £221,809.98 Index Linked index-linked using RPI from the date of this committee report, towards education provision.
 - Financial contributions of £ 2,230 Index Linked index-linked using RPI from the date of this committee report, towards healthcare provision.
 - Financial contributions of £12,470 Index Linked index-linked using RPI from the date of this committee report, towards public rights of way.
 - Provision of on-site open space play facilities
 - Provision and promotion of SANG. And the following conditions (and their reasons).

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

- B) Refuse permission for the reasons set out in the appendix to these minutes if the agreement is not completed by 24 December 2026 (6 months from the date of committee) or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager East.

14. **P/FUL/2025/07220 - Forge & Forge Hall, Dorchester Rd, Lytchett Minster, BH16 6HT**

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of four dwellings. The site was identified on a map of the area, noting that it fronted onto Dorchester Road. It was explained that the lawful use of the site was commercial, although it had been unused for approximately ten years.

Photographs of the site and its surrounding context were shown, including views of Forge Hall, Gavity, and 1 Forge Close. Existing buildings on the site were illustrated through survey drawings, and it was confirmed that these structures would be demolished as part of the proposal.

The proposed site plan was presented, along with front and side elevations. The design was described as traditional in appearance, incorporating red brick and timber-framed windows.

It was advised that the principle of development was considered acceptable due to the small scale of the proposal and the quality of the design. The site was located within a small village with access to local services, which further supported the proposal.

It was noted that the site lay within a Conservation Area and that Forge Hall was regarded as a non-designated heritage asset. A Grade II listed building was also located opposite the site. The impact on heritage assets was assessed as resulting in less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area. It was explained that Forge Hall was recommended for demolition due to structural defects, and its loss was not considered significant given its limited scale and condition.

The impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants was considered. The relationship and distances between the proposed dwellings and neighbouring properties, including Gavity, were reviewed. Floor plans, elevations and separation distances were shown, and it was concluded that impacts on neighbouring amenity were acceptable. The living conditions of future occupants were also assessed, with the scheme judged to provide adequate levels of amenity.

In terms of character and appearance, the proposal was considered acceptable and likely to enhance the Conservation Area. Features such as chimneys and painted timber windows were highlighted as positive design elements. The modest depth and set-back positioning of the dwellings were considered to allow them to sit comfortably within the street scene.

Highways considerations were addressed, with two parking spaces proposed per dwelling. Access to the site would be provided via a five-metre-wide route between buildings, which was considered acceptable.

An ecological impact assessment had been undertaken and a bat emergence survey confirmed that no bat roosts were present on the site. Mitigation measures were proposed, including sensitive lighting and the avoidance of works during the bird nesting season.

Conditions relating to contamination and drainage were noted. The proposed surface water drainage scheme was confirmed to comply with policy requirements.

Public representation was received in objection to the application from Emma Hall. As a resident of a neighbouring property, she expressed concerns about overlooking and loss of light, due to a larger building being situated on the site and closer to the property boundary.

Clare Lees and Julian Smith spoke in support of the application. They noted that Forge Hall was in poor condition and replacing it with a new development would improve the visual amenity of the area.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the scheme was considered acceptable in terms of neighbouring amenity, due to the rear extension being single storey and the fact that there were multiple windows within the impacted room in the neighbouring property, providing multiple outlooks.

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

- Officers had visited the site and could confirm the poor condition of Forge Hall and the scheme would make up for the loss of the non-designated heritage asset due to its high quality.
- The distance between the buildings was approximately 1.7m.
- Officers considered that the harm to the Conservation Area from the loss of the non-designated heritage asset was less than substantial and the proposed scheme would be appropriate in the Conservation Area.
- The ownership of the shared courtyard area would be a private matter and conditions would control access and landscaping.

It was proposed by Cllr Sowry-House and seconded by Cllr Morgan, that the application be granted.

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

15. P/HOU/2026/00276 - 17 Dudsbury Road, West Parley, BH22 8RA

The Planning Officer presented the application for the erection of single and two storey extensions, loft conversion, dormers, Juliet balconies and roof lights. The site location was shown on a map, identifying the property as being situated to the east of Dudsbury Road in Ferndown. It was noted that the property, along with neighbouring dwellings, was set back within its plot.

Existing elevations of the dwelling were displayed, followed by the proposed elevations illustrating the extensions. Photographs of neighbouring properties were also provided to give context to the surrounding area.

The Planning Officer advised that the proposal complied with the requirements of the Special Character Area and had been designed to avoid harm to nearby trees. The impact on neighbouring amenity had been assessed, with sufficient distances maintained between properties to prevent any significant adverse effects. In particular, it was noted that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm in terms of overlooking or loss of light to neighbouring solar panels.

The application was recommended for approval, subject to conditions, which were displayed to Members.

Public representation was received from the applicant, Tony Brown. He stated that the scheme had been designed to complement the character of the area. In addition, there were already a number of large properties in the area.

Members were in agreement that the proposed scheme would be in keeping with the size of other properties in the area.

It was proposed by Cllr Sowry-House 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.

16. **P/FUL/2026/02091 - The Old Malthouse High Street Langton Matravers Swanage BH19 3HB**

The Committee agreed to extend the meeting beyond three hours.

The Planning Officer presented the application for the retention of a residential unit for use as dwellinghouse and/or commercial holiday let. The application site was shown on a map of the area. The site forms part of a wider development of 19 dwellings. The site fell within the Langton Matravers settlement boundary, within the Conservation Area and within the Dorset National Landscape.

Unit 14 was shown on a site layout plan of the overall development. Photographs were provided of the access to the site, the approach to the site from Old Malthouse Land and the access via Old Malthouse Lane. A photograph of the dwelling was also shown.

Permission was being sought to retain unit 14 as a dwellinghouse, but also to be used as a commercial holiday let, there were no proposed physical changes to the dwelling. A condition in the current planning permission required the property to be used as a principal residence to reflect policy H14 in the Purbeck Local Plan.

It was explained that the proposal had the potential to result in the loss of one permanent dwelling, however the dwelling could still be used as principal accommodation or as a holiday let. The Planning Officer addressed other issues with the application, including a concern raised by the Parish Council about community sustainability, however it was considered that because the proposal would only affect 1 property within a development of 19, it would not have a significant impact on the community. No impacts on the character of the area or heritage assets were anticipated as there was no physical changes included in the proposal and the dwelling was modest in scale (2 bedroom) so was unlikely to be occupied by more than one household as a holiday let.

Public representation was received from Ken Parke, the agent for the application. He stated that the policy set out that holiday lets were not considered as second homes and where the property was being used as a holiday let it would contribute to the local economy, while a second home would be empty for much of the year. The proposal was seeking flexibility for the dwelling to be let on a short-term basis, if it was not possible to let the property on a long-term basis.

A statement was read out by the Vice-Chair, on behalf of Cllr Peter Golob from Langton Matravers Parish Council. Concerns were raised including the loss of a residential dwelling, given the high proportion of holiday lets and second homes within Langton Matravers. It was also felt that the flexible designation did not provide enough clarity on what was being approved. There was also concern that

approval of the application would lead to similar applications being brought forward.

Cllr Ben Wilson spoke as the Ward Member, in objection to the application. He stated that the application went against the intention of policy H14 in the Local Plan. He expressed that there was no demand for new holiday lets within Purbeck, but rather more need for residential dwellings. Concern was also raised that the application would set a precedent and result in further applications being approved.

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

- A condition would require that the use of the dwelling as a holiday let be evidenced by the applicant upon request.
- Generally holiday lets do not require planning permission and dwellings that are use class C3 can be let out without permission unless the use results in a material change to the character of the use.
- All applications are considered on their own merit and officers did not consider that this application would set a precedent in the area.
- In order to refuse the application, members would need to demonstrate that the loss of the residential dwelling would cause harm to local services such that the proposal was contrary to policy EE4.

Several members expressed concern about the application and felt that it went against the intention of policy H14 in the Local Plan, although recognised that the policy allowed for short term holiday lets.

It was proposed by Cllr Brenton and seconded by Cllr Skeats that the application be deferred. The proposal was withdrawn following further discussion, and confirmation that the Council's legal team would not be able to expand on the legal advice that had been provided to members.

It was proposed by Cllr Sowry-House and seconded by Cllr Morgan that the application be granted.

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

17. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

18. Exempt Business

There was no exempt business.

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 1.55 pm

Chairman

.....