

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
WESTERN BCP PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 July 2025 at 10.00 am

Present:-

Cllr M Le Poidevin – Chairman

Cllr J Clements – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr J Challinor, Cllr A Chapmanlaw, Cllr M Dower, Cllr G Martin,
Cllr S McCormack and Cllr J Salmon

31. Apologies

Apologies received from Cllr Kate Salmon and Cllr Cameron Adams.

32. Substitute Members

Cllr Joe Salmon is substituting for Cllr Kate Salmon.

33. Declarations of Interests

Cllr Gillian Martin declared a personal interest in item 6c and would leave the meeting for that item.

34. Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 12,19 and 30 June 2025 were confirmed as accurate records to be signed by the Chair.

35. Public Issues

There were a number of requests to speak on planning applications on the agenda as detailed below.

36. Schedule of Planning Applications

The Committee considered planning application reports, a copy of which had been circulated and which appear as Appendices A,B and C of these minutes in the Minute Book. A Committee Addendum Sheet was published on 16 July 2025 and appears as Appendix E to these minutes.

37. 106 Panorama Road, Poole BH13 7RG

Canford Cliffs ward

APP/24/00640/F

Demolition of existing property and erection of a replacement property.
Improvement works to the sea wall.

Public Representations

Objectors

- ❖ None registered

Applicant/Supporters

- ❖ Tom Glanfield – Applicant
- ❖ Clare Spiller - Agent

Ward Councillors

- ❖ None registered

Resolved to GRANT permission contrary to the recommendation set out in the officer's report for the following reasons:

- The existing building is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset with a significance to the lower end of moderate and its loss would result in heritage harm.
- The existing building is considered to have a neutral benefit to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the loss of the existing building would have a neutral impact upon it.
- The proposed building, along with the sea wall, would have a positive impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- Taking the above into account, members considered that the harm resulting from the proposal would be less than substantial. Such less than substantial harm would be overcome by the benefits of the proposal. Such benefits comprise climate change benefits through energy efficiency improvements and also improvement of the sea wall.
- Overall, members considered that the proposal accorded with Policy PP30, the Poole Local Plan and the NPPF

The following conditions and obligation were also agreed in principle, subject to power being delegated to the Head of Planning Operations to determine the final wording in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair:

Conditions;

- Deadline for implementation. (3 years)
- List of approved plans (for clarity)
- Materials (to match those on the plans)
- Biodiversity enhancements (we need to state a timescale)
- Demolition and Construction and Environmental Management Plan – Prior to commencement.
- Vegetation clearance outside bird breeding season.
- Construction of sea wall outside seasons of April and May

- Construction of Sea Wall prior to occupation
- Recording of historic fabric (method statement and scope pre-commencement, and post completion statement before occupation)

Obligation

- Securing BNG self-build

Voting: For 7, Against 1, Abstain 0

38. Dorwin Court, 328 Poole Road and 68 Princess Road, Poole BH12 1AR

Talbot and Branksome Woods ward

APP/23/01051/F

Alteration and upward extension of the buildings to create second and third floors of accommodation on each building to create 10 additional apartments in each block (20 in total)

Public Representations

Objectors

- ❖ Gerald Smith
- ❖ Kieran Perry – written statement read out

Applicant/Supporters

- ❖ Matt Holmes - Agent

Ward Councillors

- ❖ Cllr Matthew Gillett in objection

The following are two of the most usual resolutions:

Resolved to REFUSE permission contrary to the recommendation set out in the officer's report for the following reasons:

- The proposal, by reason of its cumulative height, scale, bulk, massing and position in relation to the adjoining building Eaglehurst, would result in an unacceptable level of overshadowing and a reduction in the quality of the outlook from the top floor balconies, resulting in adverse harm to residential amenity, contrary to Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan, and the NPPF 2024.
- The proposal does not include the provision of 20% adaptable and accessible homes and therefore would not provide specialist homes that meet the needs of an aging population, contrary to Policy PP12 of the Poole Local Plan and the NPPF 2024.
- The proposal, by reason of its excessive cumulative scale, mass, bulk, height and detailed design, would increase the residential density of the site, resulting in overdevelopment. The unsympathetic

extensions and alterations would not reflect the high-quality Art Deco style of the original building, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and character of the area, contrary to Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan, and the NPPF 2024.

- The proposal would not provide a satisfactory quantum of amenity space that would meet the needs of the future occupiers. The proposed bin stores will be located at an inconvenient distance for the future occupants of the southern block, resulting in a substandard form of accommodation, contrary to Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan, and the NPPF 2024.
- The site lies within 13.8km of New Forest SAC, New Forest SPA and New Forest Ramsar, which are protected under European legislation for their wildlife importance, where it has been demonstrated in conjunction with New Forest Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy 2023, prepared by Footprint Ecology and in agreement with Natural England that additional recreational pressure from additional bedroom numbers have the potential to harm their integrity. No mitigation or compensation measures have come forward to address such harms, and it cannot be ruled out beyond all reasonable scientific doubt that the proposal would not have a likely significant effect on the sensitive interest features of the habitat sites, from human pressures, either alone or in combination with other proposals. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy PP33 of the Poole Local Plan and Paragraph 193 of the NPPF 2024.
- The application site is within 5Km of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). This SSSI is also part of the designated Dorset Heathlands SPA (Special Protection Area) and Ramsar site, and is also part of the Dorset Heaths SAC (Special Area of Conservation). The proximity of these European sites (SPA and SAC) means that determination of the application should be undertaken with regard to the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The applicant has failed to demonstrate in accordance with the Habitat Regulations that the proposals will cause no harm to the SPA and SAC heathland. It is clear, on the basis of advice from Natural England that, notwithstanding the CIL contribution, no avoidance or mitigation of adverse effects through Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) has been secured. In the absence of any form of acceptable mitigation it is likely to have an adverse effect on the heathland special features including those which are SPA and SAC features. Having regard to the Waddenzee judgement (ECJ case C-127/02) the Council is not in a position to be convinced that there is no reasonable scientific doubt to the contrary. For these reasons, and without needing to conclude the appropriate assessment, the proposal is considered contrary to the recommendations of the Berne Convention Standing Committee on urban development adjacent to the Dorset

Heathlands, Dorset Heathlands SPD and Policy PP32 and PP39 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018).

- The application site is within close proximity to Poole Harbour which is a Special Protection Area (SPA), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Ramsar site and the determination of the application should be undertaken with regard to these European designations and the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The applicant has failed to demonstrate in accordance with the Habitat Regulations that the proposals will cause no harm to the SPA. It is clear, on the basis of advice from Natural England that, notwithstanding the CIL contribution, no avoidance or mitigation of adverse effects through Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) has been secured. In the absence of any form of acceptable mitigation it is likely to have an adverse effect on the special features of Poole Harbour including those which are SPA features. Having regard to the Waddenzee judgement (ECJ case C-127/02) the Council is not in a position to be convinced that there is no reasonable scientific doubt to the contrary. For these reasons, and without needing to conclude the appropriate assessment, the proposal is considered contrary to the recommendations of the Berne Convention Standing Committee on urban development adjacent to Poole Harbour, and Policy PP32 and PP39 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018).
- In the absence of a completed S106 planning agreement, no affordable housing has been secured as part of this development. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Policy PP11 of the Poole Local Plan, Affordable Housing SPD and the NPPF 2024.

Voting: For 4, Against 2, Abstain 1

Notes: Cllr Chaillnor left the meeting before this item

39. 31 Springfield Crescent, Poole BH14 0LL

Parkstone ward

P/25/01014/PNHAS

Prior Approval for the Removal of the existing roof and associated dormers. Construction of new first floor and roof with pitch and form to match existing (no dormers)

Public Representations

Objectors

- ❖ James Cain
- ❖ David Alderson

Applicant/Supporters

- ❖ None registered

Ward Councillors

❖ Cllr Emily Harman

Resolved to REFUSE permission contrary to the recommendation set out in the officer's report for the following reasons:

- The proposed scheme, as a result of its significant massing and height fails to respect and relate to the existing building and local patterns of development, and does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the street scene of Springfield Crescent, by virtue of its overall design and appearance, and as such it fails to comply with the provisions of Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan and it also fails to comply with the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA.2, 3a(ii) of the General Permitted Development Order (2015) (as amended).
- The proposed scheme has a materially harmful impact upon the privacy and amenities of the occupants of the neighbouring properties by means of overbearing, due to the height and proximity to the neighbouring property, No 33 Springfield Crescent, and therefore it is contrary to the provisions of Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan and it also fails to comply with the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA.2, 3a(i) of the General Permitted Development Order (2015) (as amended).

Resolution: prior approval is required and refused.

Voting: Unanimous

Notes: Cllrs Martin, Dower and McCormack left before this item. Cllr Martin declared an interest in this item at the start of the meeting.

40. Appeals report

The Development Management Manager presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'D' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Public Report

This report updates members of the planning committee on the Local Planning Authorities Appeal performance over the stated period. The committee were informed that the Council are meeting national targets.

RESOLVED that the planning committee notes the contents of this report.

The meeting ended at 2.20 pm

CHAIRMAN