



DORSET COUNCIL - NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 30 JULY 2020

Present: Cllrs Sherry Jespersen (Chairman), Mary Penfold (Vice-Chairman), Jon Andrews, Tim Cook, Les Fry, Matthew Hall, Carole Jones, Robin Legg, Bill Pipe, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout and David Taylor

Also present: Cllr David Walsh

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Lara Altree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Robert Lennis (Area Lead (Major Projects) Eastern), Simon McFarlane (Area Lead Planning Officer, Gillingham), Steve Savage (Transport Development Manager), Allison Sharpe (Business Support Officer), Helen Whitby (Senior Democratic Services Officer) and Fiona King (Democratic Services Officer)

117. Apologies

No apologies for absence were received at the meeting.

118. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made at the meeting.

119. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2020 were confirmed and signed.

Cllr Legg wished to record that his apologies had been given for the previous two meetings due to technical issues he had encountered whilst trying to access the meetings.

120. Public Participation

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.

121. Planning Applications

Members considered written reports submitted on planning applications as set out below.

122. **2/2019/0318/OUT - Land Off Haywards Lane (West Of Allen Close)
Child Okeford Dorset**

The Area Lead Planning Officer introduced the application to develop land by the erection of up to 26 No. dwellings, form vehicular and pedestrian access. The current proposals which sought outline permission (with only access for consideration) had been reduced by 6 dwellings from an initial proposal of up to 32 dwellings. It was proposed that the development would be served by a single vehicular access point and pedestrian crossing from Haywards Lane.

The Officer highlighted the proposed car park and advised that the only hedgerow to be removed would be to allow access to the site. However, if more hedgerow was removed there was a condition in place for that to be replaced. The site was considered to be a sustainable location and the Applicant had agreed to the S106 obligations, as listed in the report. The economic, social benefits and environmental benefits were highlighted and it was felt that there were no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPFF taken as a whole.

The Transport Development Liaison Manager highlighted the vehicular access to the site with the visibility splay which was suitable for a 30mph approach speed. A transport statement had been submitted along with a technical note that had looked at the parking accumulation at the school. The impact was minimal in respect of the cars being parked on the side of the road. Highways felt there were no significant safety issues with the application and therefore had no objections.

A number of written submissions objecting to the proposal and a statement by the applicant were read out at the meeting and are attached to these minutes.

Local Member for Child Okeford

Cllr Sherry Jespersen made reference to the link through the site to Allen close and asked for further clarity as the Parish Council were not aware this was a permitted path. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that the applicants believed there could be a permissive footpath, there was a faint line showing on the constraints map. Reference was made to a covenant or legal ownership that one of the neighbours had in place across the access into the site from Allen Close. Cllr Jespersen was still unclear if members were in a position to give permission for access as no such access existed and it appeared it was unsure who owned the land the other side of the locked gate. Officers advised that the red line boundary was discrete and the number of houses would be appropriate for the site. He made reference to other sites with open boundaries and people did cross them. A gate could be installed if it was felt this particular access was detrimental to neighbouring properties. The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that the footway linked to Allen Close was an indicative opportunity and the southern pedestrian link onto Haywards Lane was sufficient.

In respect of Heads of Terms, Cllr Jespersen noted that a reference was made to allotments, but there was inclusion on site for allotments and there

was no indication they would be an attractive proposition. There was sufficient allotment provision within the village already. The Area Lead Planning Officer made reference to the provision made on and off site with a contribution of £308 offsite. He advised that when the S106 was confirmed it would show only be a contribution for off-site allotments.

Following a question about the newly dedicated footpath from Netmead Lane officers confirmed that this was a contribution request from the Rights of Way officer for the resurfacing of a public Right of Way nearby. It was confirmed that the Right of Way did not link directly to the site.

Members comments and questions:-

Cllr Penfold made reference to the car park and questioned if it was part of the application. She had not seen any support for the car park and the wondered if the villagers had been asked for their views. There was concern around who would own the car park and who would be responsible for its upkeep. Officers confirmed the application was for outline and access only. Members were looking at an illustrative drawing, the land was part of the site and showed the suitability of the site for up to 26 houses. Car parking did not need to be part of the detailed application. Nobody had been canvassed, the applicant had looked at various different layouts. The Chairman felt inclined to propose an informative note regarding the car park before going forward.

Cllr Taylor asked for clarification of the speed limit on Haywards. The Transport Development Liaison Manager confirmed that the existing speed limit was 60mph but it changed to 30mph approaching the village and this would remain. Following a question about the safety of crossing the road from the car park to the school, the Transport Development Liaison Manager advised it was considered to be a safe place to cross and was essential to the proposal. The appropriate crossing construction would be installed if the application was approved. The crossing would be within the 30mph limit area. The Area Lead Planning Officer added that this was an indicative layout and the parking area did not have to be part of the detailed layout at a later stage.

Cllr Hall queried using this opportunity to reduce speed to 20mph outside the school. The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that there was no proposal to change the speed limits, village car parking did not identify a need for the limits to be changed and this was not part of the planning process. If there was a problem with the speed limit, the village would need to apply to the Council for a change.

Cllr Andrews asked about a Neighbourhood Plan for Child Okeford and wondered if the North Dorset Plan was still valid. Officers confirmed that whilst there was not a Neighbourhood Plan the North Dorset Plan was still valid and the village did have a Village Design Statement SPD (supplementary planning document).

Cllr Cook expressed concern at the rounding off of the settlement boundary especially for those members that represented rural areas. He felt it was important to look at the wider effects. Looking at the wider picture of Child

Okeford there are so many pieces of land that could have an application put forward as a result the essential rural character of the village would be changed and felt this small development could set a wider precedent.

Cllr Ridout highlighted that in the report there were objections raised by the landscape architect when the application was based on 30 dwelling, what was their view on the lower density? The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that the particular landscape officer had since left the Council but officers were satisfied that the reduction was reflective of the character of the area given the reduction in density to 20dph (dwellings per hectare). The officer had walked the site with landscape officers and the numbers of 26 dwellings were from informal discussions with them.

Cllr Pipe was satisfied that there seemed to be a natural rounding off of the settlement boundary, the trees and hedges provision had been highlighted and the 40 % affordable housing was noted. He asked would this housing be for local people to buy or would it be for rental from a housing association. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that a proportion of housing would be for people to buy under shared ownership and some would be rented. There would be a proportion of the housing that would remain for local people.

Cllr Legg asked for confirmation that the cash benefit came from every house. Officers confirmed that all houses would pay a contribution. Following a discussion about the amount of weight members should give to the Village Design Statement, officers advised that with the shortage of the 5 year land supply they would suggest that members gave limited weight to the policies in this Statement. However, the Statement does not preclude development and the site is not in a conservation area. The density was akin to what was surrounding the site and had already been reduced.

Cllr Legg highlighted a point made by the Parish Council in relation to deferring the application pending the outcome of an appeal on another site in the village. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised against deferring this application in order to wait for a decision as the other site was very different and the merits of the cases should not be mixed.

Cllr Potheary was concerned for the safety of walkers to the shops and amenities as there was no pavement or dedicated footway. She also queried if the development would be sustainable. The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that the grassed area opposite the proposed pedestrian crossing point would be upgraded to provide a footway and confirmed there would be safe access from this site and was confident there were no safety issues. There were links to the existing footway facilities also. The Chairman added that there was a small amount of pavement around the school and the bus stop.

Cllr Carole Jones highlighted that as the Village Design Statement was confirmed in 2007 members should only give limited weight to this. She felt that the fear of development was always greater than the reality of a lived in site and felt that a car park would be a valuable asset. The Chairman added

that the school had not indicated support for a car park. Cllr Jones felt that the application was sound and proposed the recommendation.

Cllr Fry queried how much weight should be given to the application as it was outside the village boundary. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that members should really be assessing other matters such as character and sustainability and it would be difficult to defend on this. Other villages had taken on extensive growth and the Council was starting to push back on some, this was not the case here.

Following a discussion about the car park Cllr Fry, whilst being aware of the issues around ownership and liability, saw this as an asset. The Chairman noted that this was a concern to the village and the school had not requested it. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that whilst this was an illustrative drawing, the points being made were relevant and could be addressed at the outline stage. However, an informative could be added to say that at the present time the Parish Council does not see the need for a car park. Therefore Condition 12 of the decision would need to be deleted. Members were content with this approach.

Proposed: Cllr Jones

Seconded: Cllr Andrews

Decision

That delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning to grant permission subject to the addition of an informative, the amended conditions and a Section 106 agreement.

123. 2/2019/1316/REM - The Brewery, Bournemouth Road, Blandford St Mary, DT11 9LS

The Area Lead Planning Officer introduced the application to erect 63 No. dwellings with garaging, parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure. (Reserved matters application (Phase 1) to determine layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, following grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2017/1706/VARIA).

The relevant planning history relating to this application was highlighted to members along with the key planning issues. Recent photographs of the area were shown to members which highlighted that a number of the buildings had now been demolished.

Following work with the Applicant, officers were now content with the design, they felt this was a high quality development.

Key planning matters were highlighted to members:-

- Flood risk
- Matters of design: Layout, Appearance, Scale
- Heritage impact
- Neighbour amenity

- Other matters raised by local Councils

The majority of the matters raised were mainly of principle and these had now been resolved. This was a large site that needed a lot of remediation.

The Transport Development Liaison Manager highlighted that the site was accessed from the historic brewery access which was already an approved access. Onsite car parking was provided in accordance with council guidance. The proposed estate road layout had been tested for emergency and refuse vehicles to be able to pass and had been approved. Highways had no objections to the proposals.

A statement by the applicant was read out at the meeting and is attached to these minutes.

Members comments and questions

The Chairman noted that this was a very significant development for Blandford St Mary.

Cllr Pipe enquired if there were any listed buildings status on any of the demolished or remaining buildings. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that whilst the development was within the Blandford conservation area but the old brewery building was not listed.

Cllr Cook asked if the non-adoption of roads caused an issue for the Authority. The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that it was up to the applicant if they wished to offer roads for adoption it was not compulsory. Highways just approve schemes from a safety point of view. Following a question about leasehold and freehold properties and any ground management fees, the Area Lead Planning Officer advised that the cost to remediate the site had been expensive and the applicant was working the Homes England to seek to provide some affordable housing. Contract terms were not normally something that the Council would be involved in.

Cllr Legg was surprised to see access of off private roads and thought there were policies around this. The Transport Development Liaison Manager was not aware of a specific policy relating to this and noted that a number of developers' sites remained private roads and developers could not be forced to make them adopted. In response to a question about whether it could then become a gated community, the Officer advised that an application could be put forward to put up a gate but that was not being proposed with this application.

Cllr Legg highlighted that outline permission was for 180 units, therefore phases 2-4 would be of a much higher density. The Area Lead Planning Officer confirmed this would be the case and noted that the future development was likely to include 3 storey properties.

Cllr Legg made reference to comments made in December regarding flood risk but was unable to any find later correspondence regarding satisfaction with the proposal. The Area Lead Planning Officer clarified the Lead Local

Flood Authorities position and updated members on the current position in relation to condition 23 which needed to be discharged prior to development.

Cllr Potheary was concerned about adequate parking being provided and whether the streets were wide enough to park in while still being wide enough for refuse and emergency vehicles to pass through. The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that the car parking numbers complied with council's guidance and confirmed that the site had been fully assessed. In respect of a query about children crossing the road to school, the officer confirmed that pedestrian links had been fully assessed at the outline stage. Cllr Potheary was now content with this and felt this was a very attractive development that would sit well within Blandford and proposed approval of the application.

Cllr Ridout asked about the random siting of disabled slots. The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that a certain number had to be allocated, and developers do try to scatter them around the site, officers had little say in where they were located. However, Highways had no issues with where they had been placed.

Cllr Hall made reference to the inclusion of French drains and asked if there was a condition to enable them to be cleaned out as much as possible. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that not only was this an exceptional site in its proximity to the River Stour it was an existing site being redeveloped so officers were dealing with flood issues to the best of their ability.

Cllr Fry enquired about any plans for renewables on the site. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised this had not been addressed but the development would be built to building regulations standard and suggested that members of the public pushed for those regulations to be changed. He also added that the development was in a conservation area close to listed buildings. Members hoped that the developers would take every opportunity to make this important and significant development for Blandford a modern and sustainable development. Cllr Fry was content to second the proposal.

Cllr Jones expressed concern at the lack of play area and to see that considering the size of the development there was no provision. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that immediately adjacent to the site was a large green space and skateboard park. Following a question concerning the provision of electric car charging points, the officer advised this could be added as an informative along alternative energies, but the uptake was a financial issue for developers.

Proposed: Cllr Potheary

Seconded: Cllr Fry

Decision

That the application be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the appendix to these minutes.

124. Dorchester Article 4 Directive

The Area Lead Planning Officer updated members on the public consultation that had now been carried out in respect of the Dorchester Article 4 Directive. Members were shown a map which highlighted the conservation areas in Dorchester.

Cllr Fry thought this was useful in order to protect Dorchester's heritage.

The Chairman thanked officers for undertaking the work on this.

125. Urgent items

There were no urgent items of business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 12.51 pm

Chairman

.....

Written Submissions

Thursday 30 July 2020

Item 5a - 2/2019/0318/OUT - Land Off Haywards Lane (West of Allen Close) Child Okeford Dorset

Mark Kerridge – Objecting

I strongly object to the Key Transport Statement

The officers have suggested that the traffic is not severe according to NPPF

How on earth can this be correct, surely common sense must prevail, please see the photographs of my objection dated 13th March (the Documents Tab.)

There has been no consideration or account taken of the speed vehicles travel along Haywards Lane, the danger this poses to parents and young children.

The technical note and date of submission was not made public, we cannot confirm this was submitted before the inclusion of the car park and the impact of the additional Highway movements. The traffic report submitted certainly does not and cannot be relied upon, it was completed during the school holiday's August 2018. It has not been updated.

The application is for TWO access points, not one single as stated, there are already 7 access points within 50 yards that have not been considered.

The road is a Country lane, not sufficiently wide enough during peak school hours to accommodate all the traffic movements during those hours, see same photographs.

The provision of a car park and school crossing are not justification to approve the Application. There is no S106 to guarantee delivery of either.

There is no guarantee the car park will be used by school parents as it is significantly less convenient.

No consideration has been given to prevent any parking along Haywards Lane by the Highways or Applicant.

Despite an email exchange with the Case officer it has not been proved beyond reasonable doubt that the land on the South side of Haywards

Lane, (by school) is completely owned by Highways to enable the provision of the footway.

There is an existing concrete access road to our property and the footpath construction will conflict with that ownership.

The footpath cannot be delivered, the Application could be subject to legal challenge.

The footway on the Southern side does not form part of the Application, it is outside of the Application red line.

Child Okeford is a rural village, this development is contrary to The Strategic Landscape and Heritage Study for North Dorset Area (October 2019) guidance for the New Dorset Plan, specifically for Child Okeford :

Avoid locating development where it may block views to landmark skyline features.

Retain the overall strongly rural and highly tranquil character of the village and its surrounds

Ensure any new development does not adversely affect the special qualities of Dorset AONB including uninterrupted panoramic views.

This application is a Speculative development and the Planning Officer has adopted a simplistic approach in applying Dorset's lack of 5-year housing supply to completely override the full application of National and Local Planning Policy.

David Taylor – Objecting

Para 3.0 of the report to the Committee states that “there are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of the application”. The Residential Amenity section states that “the site is only visible from 3 adjacent residential dwellings”.

There are 8 neighbouring dwellings, Wynchards, 3, 5 & 6 Allen Close and 12, 13, 14 & 15 Chalwell. They all share a land boundary with the proposed site and have south and west-facing windows and low boundary fences in order to take advantage of the vistas across the countryside at the edge of the village, the dark night skies and the stunning sunsets. The properties in Chalwell are not shown on the Proposed Site Plan, Sketch Proposal and LVIA.

Development of this site will result in noise and pollution from the extensive car parking provision. The access road is particularly poorly situated and will result in headlights shining directly into the main living

spaces of Wynchards and the 3 properties in Allen Close. The properties in Chalwell will also suffer from overshadowing and overlooking. The proposed density will result in overdevelopment of the site which will be cramped and share a poor relationship with neighbouring properties, resulting in substantial loss of amenity for the existing residents.

Para 6 of the report states the application contains a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom properties. The Sketch Proposal (Rev I) shows that there are no longer any 2 bed properties on site. The Sketch Proposal shows the addition of a “notional” car park and a new pedestrian access. These are substantial changes to the original proposals and the statutory consultees and the public were not re-consulted when these material changes were made. The Design & Access Statement and the Transport Statement have not been updated to take account of these changes. The Transport Statement does not reflect the additional vehicular and pedestrian trips generated by the school car park and new pedestrian access.

Para 6 states that “the site retains the footpath which enters the site from Allen Close and runs to the western site boundary” and “maintains an established right of way through the site for existing residents”. This footpath does not exist and there is no “established right of way”. The land is privately owned and the farm gate at the end of Allen Close is kept padlocked. The proposed pedestrian access through Allen Close should be refused.

The documentation is inaccurate, incomplete and unprofessional. If the Planning Committee were to approve this speculative proposal, it would set a precedent for the village as it is on a greenfield site and outside of the village settlement boundary and would open the floodgates to even more major applications.

Hetty Rutledge – Objecting

The applicants make no mention of the Child Okeford Village Design Statement (COVDS) in any of their documentation, including the Planning Statement. The COVDS expresses the wishes of our villagers, both adults and children, in relation to the design and location of any future proposals for housing. This is the first major planning application to be submitted since the COVDS was adopted by the former North Dorset District Council. It is a supplementary policy to the North Dorset Local Plan and is a material consideration in the planning process. The overwhelming sentiment of the village is that “Child Okeford is a rural

community and that is how we want it to remain". The Statement says that "the Village Settlement Boundary is not only a statutory boundary but also a physical and environmental one. In order to maintain the prerequisite rural character of the community the integrity of the Village Settlement Boundary should be sacrosanct. The geographical constraints that naturally limit growth (Hambledon Hill to the east and the River Stour to the west) enforce this tenet". The Statement goes on to say that "any growth must occur through redevelopment of existing dwellings with the constraints of the Village Settlement Boundary". The Statement goes on to say that "the vast majority of building ground within the Village Settlement Boundary has been developed and the population is close to the maximum size that the infrastructure can sustain" and "any major expansion in the village would need a concomitant increase in infrastructure. This would result in much greater urbanisation and loss of essential rural character, which is the main reason why the majority of the residents live in the village". If the villagers wanted to live in an urban or suburban environment they would move to one or not come to Child Okeford.

In its recommendations, the COVDS says that "the Village Settlement Boundary as it is presently defined should not be altered to include any more Greenfield sites and valuable agricultural land". This is a speculative application and the applicants did not, therefore, hold any public consultation prior to its submission, nor did they enter pre-planning discussions with Dorset Council. Dorset Council must defend and implement their own policies and respect the wishes of the villagers of Child Okeford. As several objectors have said, "When does a large village become a town?" The answer is when the Council approves speculative planning applications outside of a village settlement boundary, in the countryside and on valuable agricultural land.

Child Okeford Parish Council – Objecting

The Parish is rightly concerned for the inconsistent approach applied by the District to the matter of five-year housing supply. We recently supported the Council in an appeal at Child Okeford where the Council's key defence is an appropriate level of housing supply; a fortnight later this proposal is recommended for approval on grounds the supply is inadequate.

The officer report selects economically those elements that fit a desired outcome, rather than assess all matters material in a true planning balance before a decision is reached. We are faced with a paradox when considered against the approach to other proposals in the village.

No explanation is offered to justify why so many matters are left for later determination or, why this proposal is treated differently from others. There is no confidence the recommendation is made for sound planning reasons.

We have drawn attention to material changes to the proposal (e.g. access and changed site boundary) which should, but have not been subject to further consultation.

Site access remains unresolved, in terms of design and delivery. However, a Grampian condition is recommended, despite no reasonable certainty access works will meet appropriate standards or be accomplished, either by the developer or others.

The applicant proposes surface water disposal via SUDS without evidence of ground water effects and consequential drainage impacts elsewhere in the village.

These three concerns, alongside the matters brushed aside for later approval through condition, alone or in-combination, raise considerable doubt the site can be developed satisfactorily, and the presumption in favour of development cannot be confirmed. Without resolution, each and every matter subject to condition, justifies refusal, and any approval made is unsound and open to legal challenge. This proposal should be deferred to allow the full assessment of outstanding matters before any decision is recommended.

Approval in the form recommended, will remove the Council's ability to manage planning decisions for housing across the district.

The recommendation provides no certainty the proposal will be implemented in accordance with submitted proposals and importantly within any reasonable timescale. There is no guarantee it will deliver the very housing need which it uses to justify a departure from adopted planning policy.

The committee should defer this application, not only to allow the submission of evidence on matters conditioned, but to also take account of an imminent appeal decision in the village which will clarify the housing land supply situation. If a need is proven, it may be appropriate to consider this site as an option, subject to all matters being demonstrably resolved satisfactorily.

Committee should not be swayed by the offers of a legal agreement to reach a decision prematurely. Contributions will be forthcoming equally once all outstanding material considerations are resolved.

A number of further objections were received and have been circulated to members.

Giles Moir, Agent - SUPPORT

This statement is made on behalf of the applicants, ELT Bournemouth, in support of the Officer's recommendation.

The applicants having worked tirelessly with Officers and are pleased to see that the application has been recommended for approval. This recommendation reflects the proactive response of the applicants in responding to and addressing Officers' comments and feedback.

The proposal has evolved since first submitted. These most notable changes include a reduction in the number of proposed units from 32 to 26 dwellings and the incorporation of a parking/ drop-off area for the school. This proposed parking area is not required to mitigate any impact from the proposal but is offered as an opportunity to improve highway safety, providing an alternative location for parents to park, rather than on the road, during school 'drop off' and 'pick up times'.

The site sits to the north of Haywards Lane (forming the site's southern boundary). The site's northern and eastern boundaries are made up of established residential developments – it is important to note that these properties, forming the northern and eastern boundaries, are not isolated properties but formally laid out housing developments.

The proposal reads as a natural extension to Child Okeford, rounding off the existing settlement. The established planting and landscaping features which make up the site boundaries will be retained – this allows for the successful integration of the proposal into the adjacent settlement. The Landscape Visual Impact Assessment submitted in support of the application concludes that the proposal will not have any significant effect on views from the AONB, with only a small part of the site being visible from distant views and appearing as a few more roofs interspersed with mature trees.

The properties which form the site's northern and eastern boundaries are made up of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. The principal character of the area is that of housing arranged in a cul-de-sac form with the cul-de-sac extending from principal routes. The proposed layout demonstrates that a mix of housing can be provided within the site, which is reflective of established settlement pattern, retaining the same degree of separation distances and built form to landscaping ratio.

The proposal will deliver 40% affordable housing, on site, together with contributions in excess of £16,000.00 per dwelling towards local community, education and play facilities.

As detailed in the Officer's report the principle of development is considered to be acceptable in light of the lack of 5 year housing land supply and the site's location adjacent to the settlement boundary.

The proposal will make a significant contribution towards the Council's identified housing need, delivering 40%, 10 affordable units – it is hoped that Members support the Officer's recommendation and approve the application.

FURTHER OBJECTIONS RECEIVED - NOT TO BE READ OUT

Graeme Jenkins – Objecting

I'm writing to you to strongly object to the above application which is to be discussed on July 30th at the Planning meeting, would you very kindly copy every member of the committee with this e-mail.

This is a speculative development with a density of housing higher than the rest of Child Okeford.

The development falls outside the village footprint, and as the rest of the village has very little street lighting, the proposed lighting within this development MUST be removed.

Crucially it is a danger to the school. If this development were to be passed and there is a fatality to a parent or a child I would hold every member of the committee responsible.

The site to the development - IF IT WERE PASSED - needs to be moved away from the school.

Haywards lane needs to become single-tracked - as in Pimperne - to slow the traffic down close to the school.

A speed limit of 30 would need to be applied from the bridge and then 20 closer to the school.

The developers photographs were taken when there were bridge repairs, and no way reflects the reality of traffic on Haywards Lane at School opening and closing times.

The small car-park within the development BECAUSE OF SOCIAL DISTANCING AND COVID is a very poor plan.

Child Okeford is already full, the roads cannot cope with another 50 cars. The Doctor's Surgery is overfull and the School likewise.

Last winter there was considerable drainage runoff from the field. The fine hedgerow on the village approach would be compromised and this in a village with historic Hambledon Hill behind it.

Surely the large developments in Blandford under construction and planned are sufficient to provide the extra housing needed in this area.

In one development the VILLAGE would increase by 5%. How is the already temperamental water supply and sewage system going to cope?

I do not believe the CASE OFFICER has observed due diligence in this case, and a detailed letter sent by the Parish Council has not been answered.

Until there is a new plan for this area of N Dorset the Committee must REJECT this over sized, SPECULATIVE development.

David Thomas – Objecting

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application. As per previous communications I cannot agree with this amended application. My main objection is on the ground of safety:

There are so many pinch points within the village, the top of Station Rd, Hayward's Lane opposite the school to the cross is just a mass of pinch points. There are hardly any pavements within the village so any walk to the school for instance, parents and children do take an increased risk of a road traffic incident. The amount of additional cars is not 1 car per household, realistically it is 2 even 3 per household. The traffic coming through the village especially in the 2 rush hour periods is just manic. Cars are parked from Medway Lane all the way down to the national speed limit signs. Cars coming out of Hayward's Lane, Homefield etc have their access restricted by parked cars. The Highway Code is not enforced by the police and as for the public if they can get away with it they will. The school is now at bursting point, the amount of families from out side the village is staggering and compounds the safety of others.

The infrastructure of the village does not lend itself to large developments that are planned for Child Okeford. This village is not built on a main road but a small lane so pavements was not necessary as the traffic simply did not exist but there is no way you can put them in now it's just not feasible.

The doctors surgery is also at breaking point, having to wait 3 weeks for an appointment is not uncommon and you want to compound that with an additional 26 families. The village boundary was established to define the village yet you want to totally ignore this why? I get it that houses are needed but please use common sense for a location because Child Okeford is not suitable for any large development. The size of this housing estate will increase the risk of someone being run over worst being killed. This is not the first time this point has been raised or does our safety matter?

Thank you for your time.

Lesley Taylor – Objecting

This is the collective view of the residents of Child Okeford.

The report to the Planning Committee reads like a Planning Statement in support of the application and not a balanced view based on the sustainability of the site for residential development vs. the Council's need to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and to make a contribution towards affordable housing in North Dorset.

The applicants are relying upon the sustainability of Child Okeford, a village that is on the verge of becoming unsustainable if developments outside of its settlement boundary are granted. This site is outside of the settlement boundary and, therefore, cannot automatically claim the same sustainability credentials as the village. The applicants have not done enough to prove that these two fields are in a sustainable location for residential development.

The "Presumption in favour of sustainable development" can only be invoked if the site itself is proven to be sustainable for development.

At the beginning of this application process, the then Planning Officer was asked "who audits the developers' documentation?" to which there was no reply. Clearly the planners accept what the developers say is true and do not have an audit process in place, given that the reports by third-parties are commissioned by the developers and cannot, therefore, be considered to be independent assessments.

The SHLAA "identified site report" is 8 years old. There have been significant changes since then and the site should have been reviewed as soon as the application was submitted as it is outside of the village settlement boundary. In our opinion, where the SHLAA assessment of a site is out of date and the site is outside of the settlement boundary of any rural village in North Dorset, the SHLAA should re-assess the site for its sustainability as part of the planning process. Developers have access to the Dorset Explorer Map and are targeting any site that has been included by the SHLAA.

Developers are exploiting their "window of opportunity" before the Council can demonstrate that it has met its housing supply targets. In approving an unsustainable site for development, the Council is giving the "green light" to developers to build anywhere they like.

The Council should be fighting "tooth and nail" to oppose this application, using their own policies and the sustainability criteria within

the NPPF, in order to stand firm against unneeded, unwanted and unjustified development.

In our view, for the larger villages without a Neighbourhood Plan and for sites that have not been identified within the Local Plan, Dorset Council should only approve applications where applicants can clearly demonstrate that the site is sustainable and within the village settlement boundary.

Graham Scott – Objecting

As joint owner of one of the eight properties that share a land boundary with the proposed site, I wish to object to the proposed vehicular access on behalf of all of the neighbouring property owners, in relation to loss of amenity.

The properties in Allen Close were built in the late 1980's (not in the 1960's as stated in para. 5 of the Committee Report). Our property is shown on the Proposed Site Plan (P004), but not on the Sketch Proposal. Nos 3 & 5 Allen Close are orientated north to south. As a relatively modern property, the gardens are wide, but not very deep and, as shown in the Sketch Proposal, the proposed access road will come to within a few metres of our back gardens before splitting and turning both easterly towards the back of Wynchards and the entry to the proposed car park and westerly into the rest of the estate.

Wynchards is also affected by the east/west orientation of the access road, as is No. 6 Allen Close. All properties have their main living spaces facing south and west, with low fences in order to enjoy the views across the fields, the wildlife and our current neighbours, the horses.

The LVIA states in para 8.4 (Private Views) that “the site is only visible from three residential dwellings”. This is incorrect as 8 properties share a land boundary with the site.

An access road, in this location, will result in loss of amenity for us in respect of noise, vehicular emissions, light pollution and headlights shining into our main living spaces.

According to the applicants' LVIA, the owners of neighbouring properties are classified as “visual receptors” and the views from 5 and 6 Allen Close are considered to be “of high sensitivity and the magnitude of change high giving an overall significance of high adverse effect in the short term, without mitigation.” The proposed mitigation is to surround

us all with hedgerows so that “after 6- 8 years the planting will have grown and the magnitude of effect will be moderate/ minor adverse. After 8- 12 years the magnitude of effect will be minor adverse.”

As with other documentation, the assumption has been made on commissioning that the development will take place and, therefore, to minimise the effect on the amenity of the current residents, mitigation needs to be demonstrated. The best way to mitigate the harm to residential amenity is to not build on these fields in the first place. If we had wanted to live in the middle of a housing estate, we wouldn't have moved to the edge of a beautiful rural village and would have stayed in a town with more amenities.

Christina Ball – Objecting

The Committee Report does not mention pedestrian access in the Table of Key Planning Issues, despite the fact that 3 are proposed. Given that the application is for access, both vehicular and pedestrian, this seems odd.

Objection comments have been made on access (L. Taylor 9th June 2020) but not mentioned in para 10 of the Committee Report

Proposed Pedestrian Access via Allen Close

- The Planning & Housing Statement submitted by CL Planning and dated January 2019 states (para 4.5) says that “The site ... retains the footpath which enters the site from Allen Close and runs to the western site boundary.” This footpath does not exist and is not shown on the Topographical Survey.
- This error is repeated in the Committee Report (para 6.0)
- A neighbour who has lived in Allen Close for 24 years confirms that there has never been a public access through the farm gate which is padlocked. The owner of the horses climbs over the gate for access.
- The Committee Report states that “although this does not seek to provide access for the future residents, but rather maintain an established right of way through the site for existing residents”.
Existing residents have never had a right of way through the site and this access should be refused.

Proposed Pedestrian Access through western Hedgerow

- The original Sketch Proposal in the Design & Access Statement showed a proposed pedestrian access through the western hedgerow and into the adjacent private field. This pedestrian

access does not appear on the Proposed Site Plan (P004) and we assume that this has been withdrawn. The footpath shown on the Sketch Proposal from the Public Open Space to the western boundary is also redundant, if the western access has been withdrawn

Proposed New Access from Haywards Lane

- The Design & Access Statement has not been updated to reflect this new access
- The Transport Statement included a 20m footpath to the east of the access road which is not shown on the Proposed Site Plan. We assume this has been withdrawn.
- The new pedestrian access off Haywards Lane was added, at the request of the Transport Development Manager, solely in order to boost the sustainability of the site. If the notional car park isn't built, why is it there? Residents could use the footpaths either side of the access road.

Nick and Liz Smith – Objecting

The economic objective for sustainable development is to build dwellings of the right type, in the right place and at the right time.

This application is for two fields divided by a hedgerow, in the countryside and outside, but adjacent to, the southwestern village boundary and on grade 2 agricultural land. The primary school and nursery are diagonally opposite the site and not adjacent to it. The applicants make no reference to the proximity of the school in their Transport Statement.

Recently, all of the 2 bed properties have been either removed or changed into 3 beds. According to the Housing Enabling Officer, the local need in North Dorset is for smaller properties, i.e. 1 and 2 beds, but the latest Sketch Proposal shows only 3 and 4 bed properties. The provision of affordable housing has fallen to 26.9%. This mix is not meeting the local need.

Haywards Lane is one of the four entry points into the village. These lanes afford the key views that give the village its rural character. The proposed development will be the first built form visible on entry to the village via Haywards Bridge. It will also be clearly visible from Hambledon Hill which is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The proposed density is now 20dph vs. the density in Allen Close and Chalwell which is 15 dph. This mix and density of housing will cause excessive urban creep on this approach lane into the village and is more

in keeping with an edge of town location than with a tranquil, rural village.

The snaking nature of the proposed access road is out of keeping with the surrounding cul-de-sacs which are linear.

The layout, style and density of the proposed development are out of character with the surrounding landscape and make it more suited to an urban setting than to the edge of a rural village. A development, in this place, will have an adverse visual impact on entry to this rural village and also from the AONB.

Urbanisation of this site will not enhance, nor maintain, the vitality of Child Okeford and it will diminish significantly the open countryside and rural character of the area. Child Okeford is at capacity and additional infrastructure is required **before** any major applications are approved in order to support its growth. The only parties for whom this is the right time are the landowners and the developers.

The negative impacts of the proposed development are sufficient to outweigh the benefits. The application is contrary to the COVDS and to policies 1, 2, 6, and 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan and in conflict with the NPPF's definition of the economic role of sustainable development.

Josephine and Rodney Gardener - Objecting

We would like to register our concern about the Drainage officer's recommendations in relation to Flooding and Drainage in particular the 'Grampian' condition which has not been mentioned in the Officers report.

Throughout the period of consultation Mr Osborne (DCC Flood risk engineer) raised a number of substantial objections. Gradually these have been addressed by the Applicant and he has now withdrawn those objections on the understanding that any consent was to be subject to a number of conditions.

Whilst we acknowledge some of those conditions have been addressed one recommended condition, the 'Grampian' condition, has not.

GRAMPIAN CONDITION: Prior to the occupation of any part of the development, the applicant must, where permitted by downstream owners, remediate and unblock any damaged sections of the receiving system (as far as the mapped main river) to be used as part of the

approved Drainage Strategy (Land at Haywards Lane Child Okeford, Dorset – Paul Basham Assoc. – Rev 4 (15/10/2019) – Ref No: 152.5001/FRA/4). Photographic evidence which confirms appropriate capacity at culverted sections, or written evidence confirming third party refusal to permit such clearance works, should be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA

REASON: To ensure correct functioning of the downstream receiving system and to prevent localised flood risk, which may result from increased flow volumes, if downstream blockages persist.

This condition cannot be met by the applicant.

This is an unreasonable obligation on property outside of the application to carry out works for the benefit of the Applicant.

The Applicant cannot guarantee these works will be carried out.

Therefore, if the Application were to be given consent and development proceeded without such a condition it could have serious consequences for the whole village and lead to flooding of the neighbouring properties and Haywards Lane.

Finally, we do not feel that the Case Officer has addressed the external lighting strategy or made any proposal to protect Dorset's Dark Skies.

Child Okeford has little, or no street lighting any invasive lighting would have a detrimental effect on our rural habit, blight the neighbouring properties and increase the overall light pollution which has been proven to impact on mental health. It is so important that the next generation are able to see the night skies and learn about it especially as we are finding more and more information on distant stars, planets and comets. With light pollution becoming worse and worse it is vital that we keep the dark skies where we can.

Please reject this application

David Fielding – Objecting

May I first point out to the committee on what I base my observations. I was a Metropolitan Police officer for 26 years, the last sixteen as a Traffic Patrol officer (now called Road Policing) so I have a wealth of hands on knowledge and experience in assessing, investigating and prosecuting RTC from multiple fatalities to minor bumps, as an expert

witness the factors which can make a road a very dangerous. Melway Lane and Station Rd fall neatly into that category.

Please I must insist that you examine all the photos relating to the area then this submission will make more sense as those submitted by the developer are a bare faced lie and a distortion of the truth taken on the weekend.

It appears at no time as Mr Savage or his team even bothered to measure the width of the road under the circumstances could be looked upon as an oversight or lets forget that as its a bit narrow! so I have done so and there is 13ft 6inches (4.1m) of usable road space. No matter the size of the splay to the estate the width of the road is too narrow to leave the estate as parked cars are forced onto the other side so when turning left you are confronted by oncoming vehicles, (same applies for Haywards Lane,Knotts Close and Homefield) thats is why the developers took pictures on a Sunday. So this entrance will further exacerbate an already set of dangerous circumstances.

All the ingredients are in place, lack of vision approaching a hazard. Vehicles turning into oncoming traffic unable to see what's coming towards them. Parents and children on the road (a recipe for disaster if ever I saw one) combine the aforementioned with a speed limit that can not be enforced (College of Policing forbids enforcement of a limit for the first and last 10th of a mile) so drivers can legitimately pass the entrance at 60 mph.

If the committee is of a mind to approve the application then fine but I have a conscience and I can not let this pass without drawing to your attention the inherent dangers this entrance will pose. From my personal experience of picking up the pieces you could not ask for a better location for a serious RTC and it's only a matter of time before all the ingredients fall into place.

Haydn Morris on behalf of Mr & Mrs S Auret - Objecting

The applicant justifies this proposal through claimed inadequate supply of housing land, a matter apparently accepted and confirmed by the officer. *This view conflicts directly with the council's defence in an extant appeal at Beehive Storage in the village.* The council must clarify its position if it is to manage planning decisions for housing across the district.

If there is a need, why is this site to be supported, while others are rejected? Without justification, an approval here, will mean refusal of less acceptable promotions elsewhere cannot be defended.

The council must be fully confident the site will meet or exceed any demonstrable need and be developed without harm to all other material planning considerations. Unfortunately, neither matter is yet proven.

The officer report offers no confidence that: the site is suitable for the development proposed; guarantees, if made, will be met; or site issues can be resolved. Too many matters are left to chance through conditions, which, if not addressed appropriately, will render development of the site harmful. We request this application be deferred, and evidence regarding conditioned matters be submitted and assessed before any in-principle decision is reached. Drainage, and Access in particular, raise doubts over deliverability of this site in an acceptable manner.

There is no guarantee, whatsoever, that if approved the application will be implemented, and the very need used to justify an exception to adopted planning policy delivered. The authority should consider ways in which non-delivery is mitigated. While completion of the proposal cannot be required through approval, conditioning the phasing of the development to secure more than a token start and completion of key elements is possible.

With so much detail left to conditions, there can be little confidence the recommendation is made for sound planning reasons. The officer recommendation is reached too easily with too much trust placed on matters to be resolved at a later date without any form of guarantee. There is no evidence available to support that level of trust, with any or all of the matters subject to condition being capable of generating planning harm and a reason for refusal. There is no reason why evidence cannot be sought now to address or demonstrate the lack of harm to the development in principle arising from:

- access/footway details;
- drainage/ off-site flooding;
- open space delivery;
- bio-diversity;
- AMS;
- Enhanced sustainability principles;
- Lighting strategy.

These matters go to the heart of the development on this site. Provision of robust evidence and assessment is essential to provide confidence

that this is a sound planning decision in principle, despite it being an outline proposal.

Tying the satisfactory provision of the above in detail within an outline approval, will ensure delivery in an appropriate manner.

At the present time my client is objecting to the current application for the reasons set out. The proposal is poorly thought out and the officer treatment insufficiently robust.

That is not to say they will object to a sound and well-reasoned submission, promoted correctly with full supporting information in the future. I ask that this point is brought to members' attention.

Pauline Mower - Objecting

The NPPF identifies an environmental role for planned development as “contributing to, protecting and enhancing our natural environment and helping to improve biodiversity”.

Child Okeford nestles at the foot of Hambledon Hill in the beautiful countryside of North Dorset. It is a tranquil, bucolic village and that's why those of us who are incomers stay and are reluctant to leave.

Haywards Lane is one of the entry points to the village and is characterised by small, open fields divided by hedgerows. The Landscape Officer objected in May of last year and has not been re-consulted since, so he is unaware of the Tree Officer's report which highlights the ambiguity in the applicants' documentation over how much of the hedgerow bordering Haywards Lane will have to be removed in order to position the access road, the new pedestrian access and to achieve the visibility splays.

The applicant's Tree Protection Plan shows that the entire middle hedgerow will be removed in order to position the access road. The trees and the hedgerows provide vital habitat for the breeding birds. Bats regularly use the fields to commute and forage on the site. Owls and hedgehogs are also frequent visitors, as are muntjac deer and pheasants. How can this development enhance biodiversity when a large proportion of the existing greenfield landscape and habitat is destroyed and replaced by 26 houses and the associated parking provisions?

Policy 3 of the Local Plan requires proposals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. How exactly are a potential additional 60+ vehicles travelling

to and from work, schools, shopping and leisure outside of the village going to reduce greenhouse gases?

The COVDS identifies the need to maintain important views into the countryside. As one of the neighbouring property owners, I look at the view across the proposed site on a daily basis from our west-facing windows, as do our neighbours at Wynchards and No.5 Allen Close. Local children come down to say hello to the horses and adults bring their grandchildren. It won't be the same looking down an access road lined with houses. Photos of the view are available (see doc. L. Taylor Objection comment 9th December 2019). This document also shows views of Hambledon Hill so that the Committee can see how development of this site will sit in its landscape.

The Tree Survey, Biodiversity Survey and Landscape Assessment all seek to mitigate against the effects of this development. The best mitigation is not to build here in the first place.

The development of this site is contrary to Local Plan Policies 3 and 4 and is in conflict with the NPPF's definition of the environmental role of sustainable development.

Susan Case – Objecting

The reports that have been undertaken regarding the proposed building development do not address the concerns being raised.

Flooding – Since moving to Child Okeford in 2006 we have encountered numerous occasions when we have been 'flooded in' and on occasions unable to leave the village due extensive flooding. The land around the proposed site is well known to spend months of the year being waterlogged and boggy.

Child Okeford has many natural springs which cause localised flooding – this coupled with the poor state of the drainage throughout the village and a collapsed/ing water system does not support any more stress being put on an already frail sewerage system. The evidence I'm sure will be obtainable from Wessex Water as they seem to spend every other week patching something within the village, or indeed one is often driving or walking through flooded areas while walking in and around the village.

Biodiversity mitigation and Enhancement plan.

There is mixed evidence that biodiversity offsets, successfully counteract the biodiversity losses caused by associated developments.

Therefore, when looking at installing bat tubes in each property, the likelihood that these will be successful is extremely slim. [In March 2019, the British Government announced that it will mandate biodiversity net gain as part of its forthcoming Environment Bill, requiring 'developers to ensure habitats for wildlife are enhanced and left in a measurably better state than they were pre-development.]

How then can building 26 dwellings in an area which has a healthy bat colony, and indeed a large number of nesting tawny owls – which are as you'll be aware in great decline – be any way supporting the government's environmental bill.

Fitting a 'bat tube' on each dwelling will be failing to protect biodiversity and indeed leading to further losses in the prioritisation of development over conservation. With regards to conservation, once it's gone it's gone – heartbreakingly, evidence shows there is no turning back once land is built on.

Increased traffic/Road users.

It is fair to say Child Okeford is at almost choking point regarding traffic and the build-up of traffic during school drop off and pick up times. The proposed development does not in any way support the easing of this – with a 20 car carpark being of little use. Traffic speed along Hayward (and throughout the village) is a real issue and the danger caused is exasperated due to the lack of footpaths (roads being too narrow to put in footpaths)

The village is used as a cut through for many cars and agriculture vehicles, this is an ongoing issue which needs addressing before we can even think of expanding the village, with the knock on being more vehicles on the village roads.

Georgie Kerridge – Objecting

Hands off our countryside- do you value rural Britain?

The proposed development should not go ahead. The development is a reckless move, threatening Child Okeford's beauty.

We should be protecting what is most special in our landscape, such as wildlife, farmland, green spaces and especially the natural woodland and hedgerows as you approach our special rural village.

The Arboricultural Assessment (created by Barrell Tree Consultancy) is out of date and as a result incorrectly reflects the true amount of

hedgerow that will now be removed. Since the report was originally commissioned the Transport Development Management recommended the creation of a larger visibility splay which requires the removal of additional hedgerow and trees. The application has since been revised to include this amendment, but there has been no updated Arboricultural Assessment.

It is clear from the Tree Officer's comments (dated 13th July and 21st July 2020) that they do not feel comfortable with the Case Officer's recommendation. There is no mention of the Tree Officer's concerns to the committee members within the Case Officer's report. There is no guarantee that the hedgerow will be replaced properly and that it will be maintained for future generations and wildlife.

The removal of the hedgerow and the new access will change the characteristics of our village, creating an urban feel. People choose to remove themselves from urbanised areas for a reason- I left to get a sense of tranquillity and to connect with nature. With mental health issues on the rise, it is evident that bringing nature into your lives can benefit your mental and physical wellbeing with overall positive effects. By destroying areas that bring a sense of happiness/ nature into people lives (i.e. country living not an urbanised village feel) is undermining villagers needs and mental health issues. I think it is unbelievably selfish and disappointing that people think it is ok to destroy what has been crafted for us, it is quite frankly depressing!

The solution is simple. Take account of local people's needs, which in this case is to maintain our precious open spaces, focus on building on appropriate landscape in urban areas or those areas with the right infrastructure so we can protect these beautiful areas like Child Okeford for our next generation. THINK!

Gill Fuglesang - Objecting

The Applicants' documentation states that "the site is well presented and suitably located in relation to the existing facilities and amenities within Child Okeford to become a sustainable development with opportunities to promote walking for local journeys and bus services for destinations further afield."

The North Dorset Local Plan Review Issues and Options Sustainability Appraisal dated November 2017 states that, "focusing development at the larger villages would result in future occupiers being unable to access the full range of services and facilities locally, by sustainable

modes of transport, and may result in rural isolation". Rural villages are, by definition, remote from the amenities in the towns.

The site itself isn't isolated as it adjoins the village settlement boundary and has 8 neighbouring properties. However, it is

- approx. 800m away from the local shop, one pub and church; second pub is a 20 minute walk.
- nearest convenience store is in Shillingstone and is 1km to the southwest. Access is via Haywards Lane where traffic travels at up to 60mph and there are no pavements, street lighting or a dedicated cycle path.
- no footpaths connect the proposed site directly to the centre of the village, nor to the surrounding countryside.
- amenities in the centre of Child Okeford are over 800 metres to the north along Haywards Lane. Walking up Station Road into the village, there are stretches of pavement (not 700m), but you have to keep crossing the road and the pavement then runs out completely outside the Community Centre. Duck Street/High Street don't have any pavements.
- GP surgery is 1km to the north and only accessible via Haywards Lane and the lower end of Shaftesbury Road, both of which are narrow, country lanes, single track in places with no pavements or street lighting.

This site is hardly the best location to promote walking and cycling safely in the countryside.

Child Okeford is a rural village with no train station, supermarket, or secondary school. The nearest train station is in Gillingham, 10 miles away. The X10 bus runs through the village but now runs only every two hours on weekdays - no service on evenings and weekends. It no longer connects to the train service in Gillingham. If you live in the village, you need at least one private vehicle. It is likely that the residents of the proposed development will be working families with full or part-time jobs outside of the village and will depend heavily upon the use of a private vehicle, or two, for their commute and for leisure activities. The proposed development is in conflict with Local Plan Policy 2 and with the NPPF's definition of the social role of sustainable development.

Item 5b - 2/2019/1316/REM - The Brewery, Bournemouth Road, Blandford St Mary, DT11 9LS

Steve Clark (Savills) on behalf of the Applicant - Supporting

Chairman and members of the Planning Committee, we are grateful for this opportunity to address you regarding the above application and welcome your professional officer's recommendation to approve the application.

The application before you has been prepared and submitted by Drew Smith Homes in partnership with Homes England. Drew Smith Homes are committed to the efficient delivery of new homes on this site which is allocated for residential development in the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1. Approval of this application would enable delivery of homes on this site which has been stalled since it was first granted outline planning permission in 2009.

The application includes 63 of the 180 approved homes on the site, delivering much needed housing to the area. It would also create a new pedestrian link through the site between Mortain Bridge and Blandford St Mary. The proposed development also includes the provision of new tree planting, high quality public realm and a local area for play.

During the application process, the applicant has worked constructively with the Council's Planning, Conservation and Landscape Officers, responding positively to design issues raised via the submission of amended plans. The additional design features and details added to the scheme during this process has resulted in the Officer's endorsement of the development as high quality within the Committee report.

The application benefits from no objections from Statutory Consultees. Specifically, the Highway Authority has considered the existing approved access from Bournemouth Road, the service vehicle tracking plans provided within the development and the parking provision, which complies with the Council's adopted standards, to be acceptable. The Environment Agency has raised no objections on grounds of flood risk subject to planning conditions.

The applicant would like to clarify that the proposed boundary of the application site is in the same location as existing boundary treatments

and therefore the ability to maintain existing neighbouring properties would be unaffected by the application.

The Committee report addresses the key planning issues and provides a list of proposed conditions. These have been considered by the applicant and we hereby acknowledge agreement to the conditions as specified.

Given the schemes compliance with the adopted Local Plan and outline planning permission, we hope that you will endorse your officer's professional recommendation to enable the prompt

delivery of these new homes that would make an important contribution towards housing delivery and addressing the lack of 5 year supply in the Local Plan area.

If members of the Committee have any questions we would be happy to answer them on the day of the Planning Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATION NUMBER: [2/2019/0318/OUT](#)

APPLICATION SITE: Land off Haywards Lane (West of Allen Close) Child Okeford Dorset

PROPOSAL: Develop land by the erection of up to 26 No. dwellings, form vehicular and pedestrian access. (Outline application to determine access).

Decision: Approved, subject to conditions.

CONDITIONS:

1. Approval of the Reserved Matters (i.e. any matters in respect of which details have not been given in the application concerning the layout, scale or appearance of the building(s) to which this permission and the application relates, or to the means of access to the building(s), or the landscaping of the site) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced. Such development shall be carried out as approved.
Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2. Application for the approval of any Reserved Matter must be made not later than the expiration of two years beginning with the date of this permission. Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
3. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved. Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly and only in accordance with the following approved drawings and details:

- Proposed Site Plan, ref – P004, dated 16.07.20.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to clarify the permission.

5. No development must commence until details of the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site.
6. Before the development is occupied the first 15.00 metres of the vehicle access, measured from the rear edge of the highway (excluding the vehicle crossing - see the Informative Note below), must be laid out and constructed to a specification submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that a suitably surfaced and constructed access to the site is provided that prevents loose material being dragged and/or deposited onto the adjacent carriageway causing a safety hazard.

7. There must be no gates hung so as to form obstruction to the vehicular access serving the site.

Reason: To ensure the free and easy movement of vehicles through the access and to prevent any likely interruption to the free flow of traffic on the adjacent public highway.

8. The development hereby permitted must not be occupied until a scheme showing details of the proposed cycle parking facilities is submitted to the Planning Authority and approved in writing. The approved scheme must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper construction of the parking facilities and to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes.

9. Before the development hereby approved is occupied the visibility splay areas as shown on Drawing Number 152.0001.002 Rev C must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.60 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. The splay areas must thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstructions.

Reason: To ensure that a vehicle can see or be seen when exiting the access.

10. Before the development hereby approved is occupied the following works must have been constructed to the specification of the Planning Authority:

- o The provision of a 2m wide footway and associated tactile crossing provision on the western side of the vehicular access to St Nicholas C of E (VA) Primary School as shown on Dwg No 18083 Rev C (or similar scheme to be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority).

Reason: These specified works are seen as a pre-requisite for allowing the development to proceed, providing the necessary highway infrastructure improvements to mitigate the likely impact of the proposal.

11. Before the development hereby approved commences a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The CTMP must include:

- o construction vehicle details (number, size, type and frequency of movement)
- o a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries
- o timings of deliveries so as to avoid, where possible, peak traffic periods
- o a framework for managing abnormal load
- o contractors' arrangements (compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage)
- o wheel cleaning facilities
- o vehicle cleaning facilities
- o a scheme of appropriate signing of vehicle route to the site
- o a route plan for all contractors and suppliers to be advised on
- o temporary traffic management measures where necessary

The development must be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: to minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network and prevent the possible deposit of loose material on the adjoining highway.

13. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, details of the open space shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority for the provision of on-site public open space. The plan should include details relating to the design, laying out and future arrangements for management and maintenance of the open space. The open space shall then be implemented and maintained as agreed, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the landscape scheme secured by reserved matters is implemented and satisfactorily maintained in the interests of the character and amenity of the completed development.

14. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS), prepared by a qualified tree specialist, providing comprehensive details of construction works in relation to trees and hedgerows that have the potential to be affected by the development must be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works must **then** be carried out in accordance with the approved details. In particular, the method statement must **include** the following:

- a) a specification for protective fencing to trees and hedges during both demolition and construction phases which complies with BS5837 (2012) and a plan indicating the alignment of the protective fencing (to include tree situated on southern side of Haywards Lane, south of proposed tactile crossing);
- b) a specification for scaffolding of building works and ground protection within the tree protection zones in accordance with BS5837 (2012);
- c) a schedule of tree and hedge work conforming to BS3998 (2010);
- d) details for any necessary hedgerow replanting and/or translocation on Haywards Lane behind the visibility splay (in the event that any further hedgerow is to be removed beyond that shown in Tree constraints Plan ref 18332-01 or the hedge is to be reduced to such a height that the Council considers mitigation necessary). This should also accord with any future soft landscaping proposals that are submitted for consideration;
- e) details of the area for storage of materials, concrete mixing and any bonfires;
- f) plans and particulars showing proposed cables, pipes and ducts above and below ground as well as the location of any soakaway or water or sewerage storage facility;
- g) details of any no-dig specification for all works within the root protection area for retained trees;
- h) details of the supervision to be carried out by the developers tree specialist;

Reason: This information is required to be submitted and agreed before any work starts on site to ensure that the trees and hedges deemed worthy of retention on-site will not be damaged prior to, or during the construction works.

15. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, an external lighting strategy shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The agreed strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.
Reason: In order to ensure that lighting is installed and maintained in a manner which will minimise possible light pollution to the night sky, neighbouring properties and protected species.
16. No development shall take place until a definitive mitigation and method statement, following the recommendations of the submitted Biodiversity Mitigation Plan (dated 12 February 2019) has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed statement.
Reason: To ensure that the development conserves and enhance biodiversity and protected species.
17. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, which accords with the approved Drainage Strategy (Land at Haywards Lane Child Okeford, Dorset – Paul Basham Assoc. – Rev 4 (15/10/2019) – Ref No: 152.5001/FRA/4), approved addendum (Land at Haywards Lane, Child Okeford - PBA - May 2020 - Ref No: 152.5001/FRAA/1), is based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and includes clarification of how surface water is to be managed during construction, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is completed.
Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and to improve habitat and amenity.
18. No development shall take place until details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These should include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.
Reason: To ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

Reasons for the Decision:

- The Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply
- The proposal would contribute towards the Council's 5 year housing land supply
- Para 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise. None have been identified
- The location is considered to be sustainable despite its position outside of the settlement boundary

APPLICATION NUMBER: 2/2019/1316/REM

APPLICATION SITE: The Brewery, Bournemouth Road, Blandford St Mary, DT11 9LS

PROPOSAL: Erect 63 No. dwellings with garaging, parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure. (Reserved matters application (Phase1) to determine layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, following grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2017/1706/VARIA).

Decision: Approved, subject to conditions.

CONDITIONS:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly and only in accordance with the following approved drawings and details forming the approved application:

- 10838-PL100B-SiteLocationPlan
- 10838-PL101-ExistingSitePlan
- 10838-PL102E-SitePlan
- 10838-PL103A-ParkingPlan
- 10838-PL104-RefuseStrategyPlan
- 10838-PL105-EmergencyVehicleAccess
- 10838-PL106B-HouseTypes
- 10838-PL107B-SitePlan-Levels
- 10838-PL108B-SitePlan-EA-Easement
- 10838-PL109A-BatBoxLocationPlan
- 10838-PL110-Constraints
- 10838-PL151A-TypeA1-Plans
- 10838-PL152A-TypeA2-Plans
- 10838-PL153A-TypeD-Plans
- 10838-PL154A-TypeE-Plans
- 10838-PL155A-TypeF-Plans
- 10838-PL156B-TypeG-Plans
- 10838-PL157B-ApartmentBlock1-Plans
- 10838-PL158C-AptBlock2-3GF
- 10838-PL159A-ApartmentBlock4-Plans
- 10838-PL161-TypeA1-Plot09-Plans
- 10838-PL162-TypeA1-Plot17 -Plans
- 10838-PL163-TypeA2-Plot18-Plans
- 10838-PL164-TypeA2-Plot22-Plans
- 10838-PL165-TypeA3-Plans
- 10838-PL166-TypeA3-Plot54-Plans
- 10838-PL167-TypeD-Plot45-Plans
- 10838-PL168-TypeD-Plot48-Plans
- 10838-PL169-TypeE-Plot23-Plans
- 10838-PL170-TypeF-Plot01-Plans
- 10838-PL171-TypeF-Plot08-Plans

- 10838-PL200A-StreetElevations-01
- 10838-PL-201D-HouseTypeA1-Elevations
- 10838-PL-202D-HouseTypeA2-Elevations
- 10838-PL-203C-HouseTypeD-Elevations
- 10838-PL-204C-HouseTypeE-Elevations
- 10838-PL-205C-HouseTypeF-Elevations
- 10838-PL-206D-HouseTypeG-Elevations
- 10838-PL-207E-Block01-Elevations
- 10838-PL-208C-Block0203-Elevations
- 10838-PL-209B-Block04-Elevations
- 10838-PL210A-StreetElevations-02
- 10838-PL-211A-HouseTypeA1-Elevations
- 10838-PL-212A-HouseTypeA1-Elevations
- 10838-PL-214A-HouseTypeA2-Elevations
- 10838-PL-215A-HouseTypeA2-Elevations
- 10838-PL-216A-HouseTypeA3-Elevations
- 10838-PL-217A-HouseTypeA3-Elevations
- 10838-PL-218A-HouseTypeD-Elevations
- 10838-PL-219A-HouseTypeD-Elevations
- 10838-PL-220A-HouseTypeE-Elevations
- 10838-PL-221A-HouseTypeF-Elevations
- 10838-PL-222A-HouseTypeF-Elevations
- Landscape Plan Sheet 1 of 3 - m330-301revP4
- Landscape Plan Sheet 2 of 3 - m330-302revP3
- Landscape Plan Sheet 3 of 3 - m330-303revP7
- Drainage Strategy and Water Quality Management Report - BFB-AKSW-XX-XX-RP-C-0001_P02
- Drainage Layout Sheet 1 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9201-P06
- Drainage Layout Sheet 2 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9202-P05
- Catchment Area Layout Sheet 1 - BFB-AKSW-XX-XX-DR-C-9235-P02
- Catchment Area Layout Sheet 2 - BFB-AKSW-XX-XX-DR-C-9236-P02
- Exceedance Flood Flow Sheet 1 - BFB-AKSW-XX-XX-DR-C-9232_P02
- Exceedance Flood Flow Sheet 2 - BFB-AKSW-XX-XX-DR-C-9233_P02
- Proposed Levels and Sections Sheet 1 - BFB-AKSW-XX-XX-DR-C-9245-P01
- Levels Layout Sheet 1 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9240-P02
- Levels Layout Sheet 2 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9241-P02
- Vehicle Tracking Fire Fighter Sheet 1 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9220-P05
- Vehicle Tracking Fire Fighter Sheet 2 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9221-P05
- Vehicle Tracking Fire Fighter Sheet 3 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9224-P03
- Vehicle Tracking Refuse Vehicle Sheet 1 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9222-P05
- Vehicle Tracking Refuse Vehicle Sheet 2 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9223-P05
- Vehicle Tracking Large Car Vehicle Sheet 1 - BFB-AKWS-XX-XX-DR-C-9225-P04
- Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement 19194-AA-AN dated 25th July 2019
- Tree Protection Plan 19194-1.

2. Prior to any development above slab level, proposed details that ensure the continuation of and full functionality of the existing French drain arrangement (shown on EA drawing A160/08/02/006A), or where ground is raised, that a new french drain is installed at the lowest point of the new embankment on the dry side shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This drainage system must not, under any circumstances, be used to accommodate the general site drainage. The agreed details shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details and completed prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: health and safety of future occupants

3. Prior to any development taking place within 8 metres of the existing embankment, details showing construction / compaction design and construction methodology for the infilling, that will have no detrimental impact to the condition and integrity of the existing embankment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Material placement and compaction must be carefully undertaken without the use of heavy machinery tracking across the embankment. The finished ground must be suitably top-soiled and seeded to a similar specification to the existing. The agreed details shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details and completed prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: To maintain access to the watercourse for maintenance or improvements and to provide for overland water flood flows in accordance with the NPPF.

4. Prior to the installation of any fencing or gates around the embankment, a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme and completed prior to the occupation of the development and retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To maintain access to the watercourse for maintenance or improvements and to provide for overland water flood flows in accordance with the NPPF.

5. Prior to any works taking place on the embankment, a condition survey including levels and photographs of the existing embankment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of any works to the embankment a post development condition survey shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within 2 months of the completion of the agreed works.

Reason: To maintain access to the watercourse for maintenance or improvements and to provide for overland water flood flows in accordance with the NPPF.

6. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, prior to construction of any wall above damp proof course samples of external facing materials (such as brick and roof tiles) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Samples can be made available on site for inspections. The development hereby approved shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

7. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, prior to construction of any wall above damp proof course details for all string course or decorative shapes, plinths, brick headers, stone cills and corbelling shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include precise designs, materials, details, and locations of said items. The development hereby approved shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

8. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, prior to construction of any wall above damp proof course details of all eaves, soffits, barge boards and verges shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall be shown on plan at a scale of 1:5, including cross sections as needed. The development hereby approved shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

9. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, prior to construction of any wall above damp proof course detailed drawings (at a scale of 1:20 for elevations and 1:5 for cross-sections) of all windows (including cills and lintels), roof windows (rooflights), doors (including canopies, porches), balconies, and openings to include framing and glazing bar profiles, glazing type and thickness, method of opening, depth of reveal, finish shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All glazing shall be fixed with an appropriate putty not timber bead, all large scale glazing shall be well recessed within the apertures and no visible trickle vents employed, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA. The development hereby approved shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

10. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, prior to construction of any wall above damp proof course details of all external vents, flues, and any other external service ductwork related to electricity, gas, or water utilities shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include location, materials, design and finishes. Wherever possible there is an expectation that these should be painted metal not plastic. The development hereby approved shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

11. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, prior to construction of any wall above damp proof course sample panels (not less than 1m x 1m) for all brickwork to show bonding style, mortar colour, texture and method of pointing shall be created on site and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). Bonding shall be of a traditional bond not modern stretcher and all pointing shall have a flush finish. The agreed panel(s) shall then be retained on site throughout the development and act as an exemplar for the remainder of the work unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA. The development hereby approved shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no satellite dish, antenna, or other electronic receiver shall be erected or fastened to the external walls of the buildings hereby approved without the expressed written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

13. No work for the construction of any part of the development (other than the internal fittings of any building) shall be undertaken outside the hours of 0700 to 1900 hours Monday to Saturday (inclusive). There shall be no working at any time on a

Sunday or a Bank Holiday unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These construction hours shall apply to the development hereby approved until the 13th May 2021 after which date the construction hours stated within condition 19 of outline planning permission 2/2017/1706/VARIA shall apply unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

Reasons for the Decision

- The details of layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping are considered by Officers to be acceptable;
- The principle of development is established by previous outline applications;
- Para 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise
- The proposed details of this application would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Blandford Blandford St Mary and Bryanston Conservation Area and listed buildings near the site;
- There is not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity;
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.