

CORFE MULLEN TOWN COUNCIL

Telephone: 01202 698600
Email: katrinablee@corfemullen-pc.gov.uk



PLANNING COMMITTEE

There is to be a meeting of the above committee at the Small Hall, Village Hall, Towers Way, Corfe Mullen on Tuesday 28th January 2020 commencing at 7.00p.m.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'K. Blee'.

Mrs K M Blee
Town Clerk
22nd January 2020

Mrs Katrina M Blee
Town Clerk
Council Office
Village Hall
Towers Way
Corfe Mullen
Wimborne
Dorset
BH21 3UA

Members of the Committee: Cllrs Barron, Everett, A Holland, Honeyman, Howard, Mattocks, Stennett and Sowry-House

PUBLIC DISCUSSION PERIOD

Members of the Public will have an opportunity to raise issues pertaining to this agenda before the meeting starts. Each member of the public will be limited to a 5-minute slot.

AGENDA

1. To Receive apologies for absence
2. To Record any declarations of interest
Members are reminded that any disclosable pecuniary interests should be declared.
3. To Approve minutes of meeting held on 14th January 2020
4. To Note Planning Decisions Report
5. Consideration of the following planning applications:

3/19/2420/HOU Applicant: Miss H Scott Agent: Jonathan Hallet MCIAT, Colehill	Single storey side extension with pitched roof. 4 The Close
---	---

Applications and Plans are available to view online at:
<http://eastdorsetplanning.christchurchandeastdorset.gov.uk/>

6. Report from Cllr Howard on recent Planning Peer Review session
7. Items of Information and Matters for Forthcoming Agendas
8. To Confirm date and time of next meeting as Tuesday 11th February 2020 at 7.00 pm.

ITEM 3 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

Minutes of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held at the Village Hall, Corfe Mullen on Tuesday 14 January 2020 commencing at 7.00 pm

Present: Cllr A Holland - Chairman

Cllrs	Barron	Howard	Sowry-House
	Everett	Mattocks	

Officers in attendance: Katrina Blee (Clerk) and Sheila Bird (Assistant Clerk).

Also in attendance in the public gallery: Cllrs. Craven, Lortie, Jefferies and Purvis.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION PERIOD

The Chairman reminded everyone present that this meeting would be broadcast live to the internet and would be capable of repeated viewing.

There was one member of the public present.

19/359 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllr. Stennett.

19/360 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

19/361 Minutes

The minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 10 December 2019 were approved.

Nem Con

19/362 Planning Decisions Report

The report on recent planning decisions was noted.

19/363 Planning Applications

It was agreed that the following observations should be submitted to Dorset Council:

3/19/1452/HOU Applicant: Mrs J Gibson	Additional two windows inside wall of dwelling. 11 George Mews No objection
3/19/2148/HOU Applicant: Mr Cozens Agent: Shore Architecture, Poole	Raise front gable and install additional dormers to accommodate master bedroom with en-suite. Lin Erin, Badbury View Road No objection
3/19/2266/FUL Applicant: Mr J Dean Agent: Dorset Property Surveys, Bere Regis	Create new access onto Waterloo Road for 2 Home Farm Cottages; farm buildings and dwelling approved under application 3/16/1742/PNAGD. 2 Home Farm Cottages, Waterloo Road No objection
3/19/2309/HOU Applicant: Mr P Hunt	Drop kerb to widen existing dropped kerb. 17 Ivor Road No objection

<p>3/19/2404/FUL Applicant: Mr R & Mrs B Wilcox Agent: Martin Hanham</p>	<p>Erect a detached dwelling with car parking and garaging. Land adjoining 11 Brook Lane Object: The proposal will result in a dwelling giving poor amenity to its occupants due to the significant number of surrounding trees on the site, causing lack of light and sense of space.</p>
--	--

Nem Con

19/364 Date and Time of Next Meeting

The date and time of the next meeting were confirmed as Tuesday 28 January 2020 at 7.00 pm.

The meeting closed at 7.11 pm.

ITEM 4 PLANNING REPORT

PLANNING COMMITTEE INFORMATION REPORT FOR 28TH JANUARY 2020

PLANNING APPLICATION DECISIONS

<p>3/19/2100/HOU</p>	<p>Front porch and single storey rear extension. 89 Wimborne Road Granted PC: No Objection</p>
<p>3/19/2288/HOU</p>	<p>Single storey side extension. 34 Blythe Road Granted PC: No Objection</p>
<p>3/19/2309/HOU</p>	<p>Drop kerb to widen existing dropped kerb. 17 Ivor Road Granted PC: No Objection</p>

TREE DECISIONS

<p>3/19/2049/TTPO</p>	<p>T1 Oak: Fell 3 Ivor Road Granted</p>
<p>3/19/2360/TTPO</p>	<p>T1 Willow: Reduce back to old pollard points. 12 Beacon Road Granted</p>
<p>3/19/2401/TTPO</p>	<p>G1 Silver Birch: Reduce height by a maximum of 10ft to live growth points. 8B Corfe View Road Refused</p>
<p>3/19/2412/TTPO</p>	<p>T1 Oak: Reduce side canopy overhanging 27 Brook Lane by up to 2m to suitable growth points. 27 Brook Lane Granted</p>

ITEM 5 PLANS – SEE LIST AT BEGINNING OF AGENDA

ITEM 6 PLANNING PEER REVIEW SESSION

Planning Advisory Service – Peer Planning Review meeting, 15th Jan, Dorchester.

I attended this meeting on behalf of the Town Council. It was attended by about 50 Town and Parish Councillors and Clerks from across Dorset. Its purpose was to give feedback to independent reviewers on T&P Council's experience of the planning process, and on the performance of Dorset Council.

The visiting team consisted of 2 experienced Councillors, from Lincolnshire and Southwark. They had been invited by, and would report to, Dorset Council. Their report would have no statutory authority and was neither an audit nor inspection. Dorset Council need not act on it, but it would inform the Council.

It was clear that there was a wide range of experiences by T&P Councils of the performance of Dorset Council planning department. These was a subgroup of Councils who seem to have formed a closer and more cooperative pattern of working with DC planners compared with the great majority. This led to visits by planning officers to inform planning committees before meetings, obtaining clear feedback of reasons for planning decisions, and an improved working relationship. The great majority, however, expressed marked frustration at the lack of communication, failure to justify decisions or take note of or value T&P Council recommendations, failure to enforce, lack of joined-up planning between DC departments, etc., etc.

Common themes emerged:

Positives:

- The planning portal was considered good, although the poor quality of many plans and lack of proper scale was highlighted.
- The introduction of Area planning boards (e.g. reverting back to the 'old' districts) was considered an improvement, allowing officers to have at least some local knowledge and insight.
- Officers were considered by many (but not all) to be helpful and informative, provided that you could track them down and get to speak to them. This was far better than emails, which were often not answered – "speaking into a void".

Negatives:

- Lack of proper training for T&PC planning committees. No handbook of the processes and rules.
- 80-90% of decisions are delegated to officers, and there is wide variation in local knowledge and interpretation of regulations. This is bridged by local DC reps in a few areas. Officers seem to have little clear idea or rule about how much weight to give to T&PC recommendations.
- Lack of joined-up thinking between planning officers and highways (and other departments), leading to very stupid and anomalous decisions.
- Failure of DC to follow its own rules and guidelines over contentious planning decisions.
- Well-argued objections are ignored, with disruptive consequences and loss of trust by Councillors and the public.
- NPPF guidelines are much too 'coarse' and generalised to apply to local circumstances, but officers take no account of this. Local knowledge is ignored. Central directives often over-ride common sense.
- The widespread view that T&PC planning committee views were disrespected and often ignored was repeatedly expressed. Some asked whether it was worth having T&PC planning committees.
- Failure of enforcement was noted to be common and widespread, undermining due legal process.
- Feedback on why decisions were made was patchy, and often anodyne.
- The existence of a Neighbourhood Plans is a trump card in opposing applications. Objections should be referenced to such a Plan. Even if you have a Neighbourhood Plan, though, this can be over-ruled by central directive and officer opinion. Producing a Neighbourhood Plan was a huge undertaking for small and middle-sized Councils with no funding for it.

CIlr T Howard