

## **Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2019**

**Meeting Room, Osborne Centre, Church Lane, West Parley.**

**Committee:** Cllr Court (Chair); Cllr Allen; Cllr Penwill; Cllr Bamborough (reserve)

**Present:** Cllr Court (Chair); Cllr Bamborough;; Cllr Manuel; Cllr Penwill;

In attendance: Linda Leeding (Clerk)

The Planning Chairman opened the meeting at 7.35pm.

**1.Apologies:** Cllrs Allen; Barber, Parry

**2. Pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest:** None.

**3. Applications to be considered:**

**3/19/1101/FUL**

**Lone Pine Park, Lone Pine Drive,**

Retrospective planning application for 20 garages and 15 sheds on Lone Pine Park.

Members discussed this application, which resides just over the boundary in Ferndown. The Planning Enforcement Officer at Dorset Council states the park is in breach of planning control as no prior permissions have been sought during the period of additional units between 1.9.14 and 31.1.19. The site is within 400m of Dorset Heathland which impacts new development restrictions. Members resolved to collate a more comprehensive email response once more information was available and a site visit has been undertaken to assess the impact of all the numerous additions. However, an initial response, pending further information, highlights concerns relate to proximity to Dorset Heathland, proximity to the boundaries with properties outside the park, the number of additional constructions and the fact that new dwellings is also contrary to planning constraints. (Voted 4 in favour)

**3/19/1158/HOU**

**6 Dudsbury Road, West Parley**

Erect a front boundary fence (retrospective)

Council discussed the application and had viewed the fence which has already been erected and stands at approximately 5.5 foot high. Members felt that the fence had a detrimental effect on the street scene and was contrary to the Special Character Area SPG No 27 which states in item 12 of the development criteria *'existing boundary vegetation must not be adversely affected by new development. Hedging must not be replaced with fences or walls. However, where hedging is absent a combination of hedging and walls or fencing may be considered provided the hedging predominates. Evergreen hedging species should be used'*. Members feel that the fence predominates completely, which is out of character for the road, and therefore resolved to submit and objection to the application on these grounds. (Voted 4 in favour)

**3/19/0634/HOU**

**11 Meadow Close, West Parley**

1. Small ground floor extension

2. Bungalow - loft conversion

Members discussed the application and resolved to approve item 1 (small ground floor extension) on the application. (Voted 3 in favour) However, they were concerned that the loft conversion was overpowering and out of character for the street scene, had concern with overlooking and felt the proposal was unneighbourly. For these reasons Council resolved to object to item 2 (loft conversion). (Voted 4 in favour)

**3/19/1307/HOU**

**21 Lone Pine Drive, West Parley**

Replace existing roof with gabled roof with dormers to front elevation and skylights to rear elevation to create additional accommodation in roof space. Other changes to fenestration.

Members discussed the application and resolved to offer no objection to the proposal. (Voted 4 in favour)

**3/19/1301/HOU**

**30 Cammel Road, West Parley**

Single storey rear extension.

Members discussed the application and felt the proposed extension was disproportionate to the size of the property and were concerned with the proximity to the boundary fence on 2 aspects, which was considered unneighbourly. Therefore Council resolved to Object to the proposal. (Voted 4 in favour)

**3/19/0368/HOU**

**23 Dudsbury Road, West Parley**

Second storey extension to infill existing recess to the rear, single detached garage to the side and new front boundary wall incorporating double gates (Amended proposal).

Members discussed the documents for the proposed extension and then compared them to the refused proposal in 2016, which was upheld at appeal. The current proposal is larger than the 2016 refused application and members feel that this application erodes the existing gap between number 21 and number 23 Dudsbury Road. The height of the proposed boundary wall was not stated and it was felt that this should not exceed 3ft tall, in accordance with item 12 of the development criteria within the Special Character Area SPG No. 27 which states '*existing boundary vegetation must not be adversely affected by new development. Hedging must not be replaced with fences or walls. However, where hedging is absent a combination of hedging and walls or fencing may be considered provided the hedging predominates. Evergreen hedging species should be used*'. Without knowing the height of the proposed wall, it cannot be established whether the hedge would be predominant. Therefore, Council resolved to object to the proposed application. (Voted 4 in favour)

With no further business the meeting closed at 20:35 hrs