



WESTERN BCP PLANNING COMMITTEE – 17 JULY 2025

ADDENDUM SHEET

6a

Address 106 Panorama Road, Poole, BH13 7RG

Application number APP/24/00640/F

Update: None

6b

Address: Dorwin Court

Application number: 23/01051/F

Update: New Forest SAMM

Paragraph 90.A

The New Forest Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy 2023, prepared by Footprint Ecology, demonstrates that additional residential development within 13.8KM of the New Forest Designated Sites, where in conjunction with advice from Natural England, it has been recognised that housing growth and increases in bedroom numbers and the potential to generate cumulative impacts upon its integrity. There is a reasonable likelihood that new residents at the appeal property would visit the New Forest Designated Sites for recreation purposes.

Mitigation/ compensation measures are required to ensure that there would not be an adverse impact upon its integrity. This can be secured by S106, when such mechanism is in place.

To alter the recommendation in order to secure New Forest SAMMs mitigation;

Recommendation to GRANT subject to conditions and an additional obligation to secure Mitigation measures to compensate against the impacts upon the New Forest Designated sites, once such mechanism is in the place.

6c

Address: 31 Springfield Crescent

Application number: P/25/01014/PNHAS

Update: To amend Paragraph 34 in the Officer's Report to the following as there is a typo with the word 'whilst' and add commas after the word 'therefore'.

34. the increase in the roof's eaves and height would be highly visible from the side elevation of No. 33 Springfield Crescent. The existing separation distance between the properties is c.4 metres (excluding No. 33's garage) and there is a drop in topography where No. 33 sits at a lower level than the application site. The outlook from the windows on the north-east elevation of No. 33 facing the application site would be altered at first-floor level (from the roof lights). However, the habitable rooms at first-floor level have secondary outlooks to the east and south. Therefore, it is not considered the outlook of No. 33 will be materially harmed nor would the proposal appear overbearing from these windows. Considering No. 33 is located to the south-west of the application site, there would not be a material increase to overshadowing which would differ greatly from the existing situation. Whilst there would be a minor increase, the windows on the side elevation of No. 33 do not serve habitable rooms and/or have secondary outlooks. Therefore, the proposal would not result in harmful loss of light to No. 33.

Update: to amend paragraph 27 as there is a typo within the sentence. The sentence should read as follows:

27. The proposal would also comply with the requirements AA.3.1, according with the procedure for applications for prior approval; and would comply with the conditions specified within AA2.2). The assessment of this is set out in Appendix 1.

Update: Changes have been made to the Planning history with the references in the planning history being swapped around.