



## Northern Area Planning Committee

**Date:** Thursday, 30 July 2020  
**Time:** 10.00 am  
**Venue:** MS Team Live Event This meeting will be held remotely as an MS Teams Live Event [please see link below]

**Membership: (Quorum 6)**

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

---

**Chief Executive:** Matt Prosser, South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 1UZ (Sat Nav DT1 1EE)

**For more information about this agenda please contact Fiona King 01305 224186 [fiona.king@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:fiona.king@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk)**

---



For easy access to the Council agendas and minutes download the free public app Mod.gov for use on your iPad, Android and Windows tablet. Once downloaded select Dorset Council.

Members of the public are invited to access this meeting with the exception of any items listed in the exempt part of this agenda.

This meeting will be held remotely as an MS Teams Live Event

[Link to Northern Area Planning Committee](#)

Members of the public are invited to make written representations provided that they are submitted to the Democratic Services Officer no later than **8.30am on Tuesday 28 July 2020** This must include your name, together with a summary of your comments and contain no more than 450 words.

If a councillor who is not on the Planning Committee wishes to address the committee, they will be allowed 3 minutes to do so and will be invited to speak before the applicant or their representative provided that they have notified the Democratic Services Officer by **8.30am Tuesday 28 July 2020.**

**Please note** that if you submit a representation to be read out on your behalf at the committee meeting, your name, together with a summary of your comments will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

Please refer to the guide to public participation at committee meetings for general information about speaking at meetings [Guidance to Public Speaking at a Planning Committee](#) and specifically the "***Covid-19 Pandemic – Addendum to the Guide to Public Speaking Protocol for Planning Committee meetings***" included as part of this agenda (see agenda item 4 - Public Participation).

#### **Using social media at virtual meetings**

Anyone can use social media such as tweeting and blogging to report the meeting when it is open to the public.

# AGENDA

Page No.

## 1 APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence

## 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of interest

## 3 MINUTES

5 - 28

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on ???

## 4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

29 - 30

Members of the public wishing to speak to the Committee on a planning application should notify the Democratic Services Officer listed on the front of this agenda. This must be done no later than two clear working days before the meeting. Please refer to the [Guide to Public Speaking at Planning Committee](#).

**The deadline for speaking at this meeting is 8.30am on Tuesday 28 July 2020.**

## 5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

To consider the applications listed below for planning permission

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

31 - 56

To consider a report by the Head of Planning.

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

57 - 80

To consider a report by the Head of Planning.

## 6 DORCHESTER ARTICLE 4 DIRECTIVE

To receive an update from the Area Lead Planning Officer.

## **7 URGENT ITEMS**

To consider any items of business which the Chairman has had prior notification and considers to be urgent pursuant to section 100B (4) b) of the Local Government Act 1972

The reason for the urgency shall be recorded in the minutes.



## **DORSET COUNCIL - NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 23 JUNE 2020**

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

**Apologies:** Cllrs Robin Legg

**Also present:** Cllr David Walsh

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

Andrew Collins (Principal Planning Officer), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Charlotte Haines (Senior Planning Officer), Robert Lennis (Area Lead (Major Projects) Eastern), Carol McKay (Senior Definitive Map Technical Officer), Steve Savage (Transport Development Manager), Vanessa Penny (Definitive Map Team Manager), Hannah Smith (Planning Area Manager), Frances Summers (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Neil Turner (Development Team Leader, Highways) and Fiona King (Democratic Services Officer)

**105. Apologies**

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Robin Legg.

**106. Declarations of Interest**

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

However, in respect of Minute 109 Cllr Jon Andrews advised that he had been a member of the Regulatory Committee back in 2018, and would not take part in the debate or vote.

Cllr Mary Penfold declared a non-pecuniary interest in the Traffic Regulation Order at Sheeplands, Sherborne (Minute 110) because as a former district councillor she had previous involvement in the Barton Farm Development Site. Cllr Penfold undertook to withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the item. Cllr Matt Hall also declared an interest in this item, in respect of pre-determination. Cllr Hall advised he would speak as the Local Member but not take part in the debate or vote.

In respect of Minutes 112 and 113 Cllr Val Potheary advised that although she chaired the Planning Committee at Gillingham Town Council she had not pre-determined on either of the Gillingham applications being determined on this agenda.

**107. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2020 were confirmed and signed.

**108. 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.

**109. P186 Application to divert part of Footpath 6, Gussage St Michael**

Cllr Jon Andrews withdrew from the meeting for this item.

The Committee received a report which considered representations received to the Dorset Council (Part of Footpath 6, Gussage St Michael at Ryalls) Public Path Diversion Order 2020, whether or not to submit it to the Secretary of State for confirmation and the stance that the Council should take if submitted.

The Senior Definitive Map Technical Officer explained that as objections had been received the Order the Council could not confirm, the Order itself and had to come before the Committee. A presentation was given to members showing the current and the proposed new route of the Path. 16 objections to the Order had been received. The majority of the objectors felt there would be a negative impact on the enjoyment of the Path. Those in support of the Path felt the new proposed route was a more enjoyable and accessible route. Members would need to decide if the application should be submitted to the Secretary of State, either supporting the Order or taking a neutral stance. The Senior Solicitor explained to members the reason for the Council taking a neutral stance instead of supporting the Order would mean the Council would not take an active part in any Public Inquiry that may arise and therefore reduce the burden of resources on the Council.

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

The Senior Definitive Map Technical Officer felt that the points raised by members of the public had all been covered in the report. There were a couple of suggestions that the Path was being altered to go over the packhorse bridge which was not the case as the current route already ran over it. The safety of the bridge was mentioned in some statements and paragraphs 5.5 and 5.6 in the report clarified that the accessibility of the structure should be balanced against the enjoyment that it brings to those who have objected to the Order. The use and availability of the current footpath was also raised in some statements which was dealt with in paragraphs 4.22 to 4.33 of the report which stressed that the use of the current footpath was not a pre-requisite for diverting a path and any obstructions should be disregarded. The issue regarding incorrect search information being provided to the applicant by East Dorset District Council when he bought the property was dealt with in the report at paragraphs 6.1 to 6.4 which stated that these circumstances could not be taken into account.

### **Members comments and questions**

Cllr Taylor sought clarification on the view being maintained with the path going past the packhorse bridge. The Senior Definitive Map Technical Officer advised that it was not possible to protect the view but those in support of the Order preferred to see the packhorse bridge from the new path whilst those opposing the Order preferred to walk over it on the definitive route, but if in the future the landowner wanted to put in a hedge or something to obscure the bridge the Council could not do anything about that.

Cllr Les Fry asked if there was any compromise on the routes of the 2 paths. The Officer advised that with a diversion order there was no scope to recommend that a permitted path be created and conditions could not be put in place. The current position was that this was a legal Order that had been made and that was what had to be worked with. The Secretary of State would review the Order and consider whether to confirm or not should members decide this course of action. Following a question about responsibility for any injury on the bridge, the officer advised that it would be either the Council or the landowner. Accessibility was more of a secondary issue.

Cllr Bill Pipe queried that if Dorset County Council had agreed this Order 3 years ago, why does it still not stand. The Officer advised that Order making was a 2 part process, and the Council is unable to confirm an Order when there are objections. The delay had been due to a backlog of Orders. Cllr pipe felt that the new route protected the privacy of the landowner.

Cllr Belinda Ridout advised that she was aware that there would be some impact on the public but felt that the Order should be submitted to the Secretary of State on a neutral stance.

Cllr Cook felt that what was being proposed was a safe and sensible solution and hoped that property owners in the future would have regard for looking at historic monuments.

**Proposed:** Cllr Ridout

**Seconded:** Cllr Fry

### Decision

That:

The Order be submitted to the Secretary of State for determination; and

The Council take a neutral stance in the proceedings.

### Reasons for Decision

As there have been objections to the Order Dorset Council cannot confirm it itself but may submit it to the Secretary of State for an Inspector to be appointed to consider confirmation; and

The representations received to the Order challenge its compliance with the legal tests for the confirmation of a diversion order under the Highways Act. If the Council takes a neutral stance in the matter, the burden on the resources of the Council is substantially reduced and the matter could be progressed more swiftly.

## 110. Traffic Regulation Order

### One-Way System for Vehicular Traffic at Sheeplands Lane, Sherborne

- a) Cllr Penfold withdrew from the meeting for this item.  
Cllr Matt Hall spoke as the Local Member and did not participate in the vote.  
The Committee received a report which considered the objections made in relation to a Traffic Regulation Order which was required in to give effect to the one-way system for vehicular traffic at Sheeplands Lane, Sherborne.

The Development Team Leader for Highways explained this Order had been brought forward as a condition in relation to a recent planning application. The Order had been advertised in the Western Gazette and notices had been erected on Sheeplands Lane. Members were advised that 12 responses had been received in support of the Order. 3 objections had been received, 2 of which were from the same household and were therefore counted as 1.

#### **Local Members Cllr Matt Hall and Cllr Jon Andrews**

Cllr Hall made reference to the planning permission for the Barton Farm development and the Order that had been made as a result. The road was very narrow and was not suitable for 2 way traffic. The residents on the new estate were effectively turning on a blind bend. Part of the new estate was employment land and therefore there was an increase in HGVs using the road. He felt this was an excellent scheme which would improve safety and was much needed.

Cllr Andrews agreed with the previous comments that had been made. He made reference to the climate impact slide from the presentation and noted that the new road did actually go a bit further. This scheme was part of planning permission that had been granted and the visibility of junction was dangerous. Following a question about Give Way signs, the Development Team Leader advised that there would not be a Give Way sign itself but there would be road markings to show this. Other signage had been detailed in the officer's report and presentation.

Following discussion members could see the benefits and the need for this Order.

**Proposed:** Cllr Andrews

**Seconded:** Cllr Fry

#### Decision

That having considered the representations received in response to public advertisement and the officers report, that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to implement the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised.

## 111. Planning Applications



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

**112. 2/2019/1649/REM, Land East of Barnaby Mead, Gillingham**

The Area Manager for Planning and Community Services introduced the application to erect 50 No. dwellings, form vehicular and pedestrian access. (Reserved matters application to determine access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale; following grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2016/0149/OUT).

The Area Manager explained the reasons for the previous refusals and described the revised plans. The proposed layout was highlighted and explained to members.

The proposal was considered to protect the amenity of the neighbours to the site. The proposed bungalows would have no permitted development rights for roof alterations. No harm was identified in relation to heritage assets.

The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised members that the outline application had fully considered the traffic impact and highways were content with it. The road layout had been restricted to a 20mph speed limit. The application was fully compliant with the guidance provided and car parking had also been provided within the plans. A refuse vehicle could drive around the site with ease, therefore there were no objections from the Highways department.

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.

The Area Manager for Planning and Community Services responded to comments from members of the public in respect of drainage which had been dealt with in the outline consent, so therefore had been addressed. In respect of access, highways safety was looked at during the outline stage and no objections had been raised.

In respect of the solar panel, some harm was identified as there would be partial shading. However, the weight attached to this was for members to decide, and officers did not consider it would amount to demonstrable harm that would outweigh the benefits in terms of housing provision against the current shortfall.

In respect of a question raised by an objector relating to the low traffic levels identified by the outline application's transport assessment, the Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that the assessment had provided a future year scenario for 2020 which predicted a realistic traffic level.

**Local Members for Gillingham**

Cllr David Walsh supported the application and believed that the applicant had worked hard to mitigate measures. This was the first time bungalows had been incorporated into a development to alleviate concerns by local residents.

Cllr Belinda Ridout had followed this application for a long time and was satisfied that material concerns had been addressed. She felt that the impact on the character of Bay had also been addressed. This was a highly sustainable location with a good mix of housing.

Cllr Val Potheary noted that although objectors felt there was overdevelopment of the site she felt the scheme was far improved from the last one with the inclusion of bungalows. She recognised that the addition of flats was not welcomed by everyone. However, she was concerned about the planting and the solar array. The Area Manager felt that these concerns had been addressed with Condition 14. Cllr Potheary felt that the developer had done their best to address the concerns of the people in the town.

**Members comments and questions:**

Cllr Tim Cook was concerned about the solar array and asked if a condition could be included that certain properties of the development had an equivalent number of solar panels to bring back the power that would be lost. The Area Manager advised that officers were restricted by council policies and although officers had tried to mitigate harm arising from schemes, the report sought to address the harm that would be caused. There has to be demonstrable harm to refuse a scheme so it was felt officers were unable to add a condition about the solar panels and extra solar panels were not part of this application. The Chairman added that there were no planning policies available to enable members to insist on solar panels on other buildings. In respect of measures to mitigate the loss, the Area Manager advised that a condition had been put in place to ensure no planting was undertaken that would hinder the panels.

Cllr Jon Andrews was in favour of supporting the application and was pleased to see the inclusion of flats. The Area Manager confirmed the configuration of the flats were for smaller 2 bedroom properties.

Cllr Les Fry felt that council policies were not quite in step in respect of climate change and this was a missed opportunity. Following a question about the existing trees the Area Manager advised that Condition 14 sought to ensure there was a planting schedule that would not lead to tall trees that would not overshadow the solar panels more.

Cllr Carole Jones felt the layout looked very well throughout. She asked about the density in the local area. The Area Manager advised that this scheme was slightly lower than 25%, officers would usually expect to see 35%. Bayfields reflected the more house type density of 35% per hectare but there were a transition of densities across Bay. Cllr Jones felt that the environmental concerns could be taken forward through the Local Plan.

Cllr David Taylor asked if the drainage problems raised by the objectors had this been accounted for. The Area Manager confirmed they had been addressed and this scheme should increase the robustness of drainage going forward.

Cllr Bill Pipe felt this was a more realistic application. He was concerned about sewage and drainage services and asked if there would be new provision. The Area Manager confirmed the development would be connected to the existing infrastructure and there was a condition in place to cover this.

Cllr Matt Hall made reference to trees and shrubs having a positive effect and asked who would be looking after all the green space. The Area Manager confirmed that Condition 14 was looking for more shrub based plants with less maintenance. The usual 5 year maintenance was included in Condition 7, but this could be extended if members felt this was appropriate.

Following a discussion, members agreed to extend Condition 7 to 15 years.

**Proposed:** Cllr Ridout

**Seconded:** Cllr Potheary

#### Decision

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

#### **113. 2/2019/1554/FUL, Bleet Farm, Bleet Lane, Gillingham**

The Planning Officer introduced the application to erect a replacement dwelling and retain 3 No. parking spaces.

This application followed a previous application which had been refused and was then dismissed at appeal. This revised scheme now proposed a 2 storey element but with a reduction in width and was set back further from the edge of the field. The Planning Officer highlighted a full landscaping plan which was also available on the website

The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that there was no objection from highways as the application was a like for like replacement dwelling.

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

#### **Local Members for Gillingham**

Cllr Val Potheary made reference to the objections and noted that there seemed to be some confusion of existing farmhouse in comparison with the new development. The Planning Officer explained that the 50% increase was not a policy requirement but assists in the assessment of the application, this was not a key policy requirement. The Inspector in the appeal decision advised that the outbuilding could be deemed part of the dwelling. Following a question about whether the enclosed covered balcony had been included in the calculations, the Planning Officer advised it had not, only the external habitable floor space was calculated. Cllr Potheary felt that any large building on the ridgeline was bound to be controversial and feared there would be light pollution. Her main concern was the increase in scale on the existing farmhouse and was unable to support application.

Cllr Belinda Ridout noted that this proposed dwelling was in a very elevated position overlooking the Stour Valley and was a contemporary design which would not suit everyone. She had a few concerns:

- Landscaping a good mix listed but in respect of a future maintenance scheme (Condition 5) could this be made more robust, maybe protect the planting and number of years for maintenance. The Area Manager advised that the standard condition was for 5 years but this could be extended to 15 years.
- Glazing, concerned about glare. The Area Manager advised that this would need to be amended on the Plan but a condition for anti glare glazing could be included. A condition could be added to require submission of detail of automatic blinds to come down outside of daylight hours.
- Future maintenance of exterior cladding, can a condition be added to this effect. With reference to the materials there was a need to ensure the property was nestled into the hills and this would need to be a neutral palette. The Planning Officer advised that Condition 8 could be amended to remove permitted development rights by stating this would include any rendering or cladding of the walls to address any long term concerns.

#### **Members comments and questions:**

Cllr David Taylor asked where the balcony would look over to and that it could be rather imposing if it looked over the village. The Planning Officer advised that the views were looking over the valley and the roof would overhang. The property was a significant distance from the village and was not looming over any other properties.

Cllr Matt Hall made reference to the trees listed in the landscape plan and was concerned they were not the appropriate types and that there were better alternatives that could be used. He felt the whole application seemed to be about blending the building in using the planting. The Planning Officer advised that the Tree Officer had been consulted on the mix of species and supported the proposal. Cllr Hall felt that any tree planting must be of a minimum size when planted to ensure coverage. The Planning Officer undertook to look to amend the condition to address this. The Area Manager added that Condition 5 supplied the exact landscaping element and species could perhaps be dealt with by conditions. A paragraph could be added to say all planting shall be ..... and then specify the size, minimum of 3 metres. The number of years was part of the maintenance condition and could be extended to 15 years.

Cllr Bill Pipe felt that this was a right and proper application and members' should move to the vote. He was not convinced the Committee should be putting stipulations on planning applications with regard to the height of trees.

Cllr Carole Jones was very pleased with the design but despaired of people who were afraid of a contemporary new look. She also felt the owner's views should not be obstructed.

Cllr Jon Andrews, feel contemporary plan complements the views and would like to approve the application.

Cllr Tim Cook, supported the proposals submitted. He felt the view should not be obstructed for the householders and that members needed to be bold in allowing this type of development.

Following discussion and confirmation of the amendments members wished to make to the Conditions, the proposal with amended Conditions was put to the vote:-

- Additional condition – non reflective glazing
- Additional condition – automated blackout blinds on NW elevation
- Amended Condition 5 – soft landscaping
- Amended Condition 6 – extend maintenance period to 15 years
- Amended Condition 8 – removal of PD rights to include any changes to the external finishes of the dwelling house.

The proposal to include the amended conditions was carried, 6 members for and 4 members against.

**Proposed:** Cllr Ridout

**Seconded:** Cllr Andrews

#### Decision

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

#### **114. 2/2018/0372/OUT, Land at E373160 N117864, Pond Walk, Stalbridge**

The Area Manager for Planning and Community Services introduced the application to develop land by the erection of 9 No. dwellings. (Outline application with all matters reserved). Looking at the principle of development. Members were advised there was no affordable housing requirements with this application due to the number of units reducing to 9, and that no Neighbourhood Plan had been developed for this area.

The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that the existing section of Pond Walk was adopted for the majority of its length. Final remedial works were being carried out on last piece in readiness for adoption. In principle Highways were supportive of the application.

An objection to the proposal was read out at the meeting along with a statement from the applicant, both are attached to these minutes.

Following discussion members were content with the proposal.

**Proposed:** Cllr Andrews

**Seconded:** Cllr Taylor

#### Decision

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

**115. 2/2019/1678/FUL, Yewstock College, Sturminster Newton**

The Area Manager for Planning and Community Services introduced the application to erect a perimeter security fence and matching gates, 2.33 metres high with Exempla welded steel wire mesh panels.

Members were advised that the purpose of the fence mainly was to keep the children safe and to keep intruders out.

Cllr Les Fry, was content to propose the recommendation. He advised members that in his previous occupation he had on numerous occasions had to recommend such a fence and felt this application was both sensible and practical.

**Proposed:** Cllr Fry

**Seconded:** Cllr Taylor

Decision

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

**116. Urgent items**

There were no urgent items of business.

**Duration of meeting:** 10.00 am - 3.51 pm

**Chairman**

.....

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 2/2019/1649/REM

**APPLICATION SITE:** Land East Of, Barnaby Mead, Gillingham, Dorset

**PROPOSAL:** Erect 50 No. dwellings, form vehicular and pedestrian access.  
(Reserved matters application to determine access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale; following grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2016/0149/OUT).

**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:

1100 B1, 1101 B2, 1400 A1, 1401 A2, 1820 A1, AHL.01 B, BML.01\_B, CSL.01\_B, DML.01\_B, RSL.01 B, ASTE190223 SS.19\_A, P.13.E A, P.13.P A, P.31-36.P2 A, P.37-38.E A, P.37-38.P A, P.39-41.E A, P.39-41.P A, P.4-5.E A, P.4-5.P A, P.42-43.E A, P.42-43.P A, P.44-45.E A, P.44-45.P A, P.46\_48.E A, P.46\_48.P A, P.47.E A, P.47.P A, P.6-7.E A, P.6-7.P A, P.8.E A, P.8.P A, P.9-10.E A, P.9-10.P A, A108239\_1100\_P5, A108239\_1101\_A1, P.14-16.P A, P.17.E A, P.17.P A, P.18-19.E A, P.18-19.P A, P.2-3.E A, P.2-3.P A, P.20-21.E A, P.20-21.P A, P.22-23.E A, P.22-23.P A, P.24-25.E A, P.24-25.P A, P.26-28.E A, P.26-28.P A, P.29-30\_49-50.E A, P.29-30\_49-50.P A, P.31-36.E1 A, P.31-36.E2 A, P.31-36.P1 A P.31-36.P2 A, P.37-38.E A, P.37-38.P A, P.39-41.E A, P.39-41.P A, P.4-5.E A, P.4-5.P A, P.42-43.E A, P.42-43.P A, P.44-45.E A, P.44-45.P A, P.46\_48.E A, P.47.E, P.47.P A, P.6-7.E A, P.6-7.P A, P.8.E A, P.8.P A, P.9-10.E A, P.9-10.P A, A108239\_1100\_P5, A108239\_1300\_P3, A108239\_1301\_A1, A108239\_1322\_A1, A108239\_1350\_P2, A108239\_1360\_A1, A108239\_1361\_A1, A108239\_1400\_T3, A108239\_1401\_A1, A108239\_1810\_A1, A108239\_1820\_A1, A278 LA01, A278 PP02, ASTE190223 AHL.01\_A, ASTE190223 BML.01\_A, ASTE190223 DML.01\_A, ASTE190223 RSL.01\_A, ASTE190223\_CSE.01\_A, ASTE190223\_CSL.01\_A, ASTE190223\_CSL.01\_A(1), P.1.E A, P.1.P A, P.11-12.E A, P.11-12.P A, P.14-16.E A

Forming the approved application.

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

2. Prior to the construction of the development above foundation level, large scale details of the chimneys, porches, eaves, plinths, lintels, windows and external doors shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is appropriately detailed having regard to the sites location on the edge of Bay.

3. Prior to the construction of the development above foundation level, samples to be used in the construction of the boundary walls, external walls of the dwellings, and the roof of the dwellings shall be submitted to the local

planning authority for approval in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is appropriately detailed having regard to the sites location on the edge of Bay.

4. Prior to the construction of any hard surface, details of the materials to be used in the construction of the carriageways, shared surfaces and footways shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is appropriately detailed having regard to the sites location on the edge of Bay.

5. Prior to the construction of any external wall or brick enclosure, a sample panel measuring at least 1m by 1m shall be erected on site to include the brick, coursing, mortar and bond of the brickwork for approval in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample panel. The sample panel shall remain on site until completion of the dwellings to roof plate.

Reason: To ensure that the development is appropriately detailed having regard to the sites location on the edge of Bay.

6. No works above foundation level shall commence on site until precise details of all tree, shrub and hedge planting (including positions and/or density, species and planting size) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Planting shall be carried out before the end of the first available planting season following substantial completion of the development. In the five year period following the substantial completion of the development any trees that are removed without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority or which die or become (in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority) seriously diseased or damaged, shall be replaced as soon as reasonably practical and not later than the end of the first available planting season, with specimens of such size and species and in such positions as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority. In the event of any disagreement the Local Planning Authority shall conclusively determine when the development has been completed, when site conditions permit, when planting shall be carried out and what specimens, size and species are appropriate for replacement purposes.

Reason: In the interests of continued visual public amenity and to ensure that there is a sufficient landscaped buffer between the site and Bay and that the amenity area adjacent to the river is appropriately landscaped.

7. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a schedule of landscape maintenance covering a minimum period of five years following substantial completion of the development (including details of the arrangements for its implementation) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The subsequent maintenance of the development's landscaping shall accord with the approved schedule.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by the proper maintenance of existing and/or new landscape features.



8. Before any works commence on site, a full survey of the site as existing shall be undertaken, submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The survey shall, by reference to site layout drawings of an appropriate scale, include, as appropriate, the following information:

- (a) The location, species, girth or stem diameter, accurately plotted crown spread and a unique reference number of all trees with a stem diameter of 100mm or greater within or immediately adjoining the site.
- (b) A numbered tree condition schedule together with proposals for surgery or other works, where appropriate.
- (c) Existing ground levels including, where appropriate, sufficient detail to allow proper consideration of measures for the protection of existing trees and root systems.
- (d) The location, spread and other relevant details of existing hedgerows, hedges and other significant areas of vegetation.
- (e) The location and dimension of existing watercourses, drainage channels and other aquatic features and bank levels as appropriate.
- (f) Existing boundary treatments and means of enclosure.
- (g) Existing structures, services and other artefacts including hard surfaces.
- (h) An indication of land use, roads or other means of access, structures and natural features on the land adjoining the site.
- (i) The route of existing footpaths and public rights of way on land adjoining the site.
- (j) A north point and scale.
- (k) A location map.

Reason: To allow the proper consideration of the impact of the proposed development on the well-being of the existing trees and vegetation together with the visual amenity and ecological value of the existing site.

9. Before any works commence on site, a detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment shall, by reference to site layout drawings of an appropriate scale, be carried out, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Based on the Tree Survey, the assessment will identify and assess the impact of the proposed development on the existing trees on site, as well as any appropriate measures to alleviate this impact. The measures identified to alleviate impacts shall thereafter be implemented for the duration of the construction programme.

Reason: To ensure thorough consideration of the impact of the development and any mitigating measures on the existing trees.

10. Before any works commence on site a detailed Method Statement shall be produced, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement will include details of how the existing trees are to be protected and managed before, during and after development and shall include information on traffic flows, phased works and construction practices near trees. The development shall thereafter accord with the approved Statement.

Reason: To ensure thorough consideration of the impacts of development on the existing trees.

11. Before the instillation of any external lighting, a scheme showing precise details of all external lighting (including appearance, supporting columns, siting, technical details, power, intensity, orientation and screening of the lamps) shall

be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Any such scheme shall require approval to be obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the development is first occupied and shall be permanently maintained thereafter. No further external lighting shall be installed on site without the prior approval, in writing, of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of the amenity of the area and the river corridor.

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional window or other opening permitted by Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order shall be made in the rear roof slope of plots 46, 47, and 48 (the bungalows adjacent to Barnaby Mead), unless an application for planning permission in that behalf is first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development of the site to safeguard amenity.

13. Prior to the construction of the development above foundation level, full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals for the drainage basin shall, by reference to site layout drawings of an appropriate scale, be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include, as appropriate, the following information:

- (a) Proposed finished levels or contours.
- (b) Means of enclosure.
- (c) Hard surfacing materials.
- (d) Proposed functional services above ground.
- (e) Planting plans.
- (f) Schedule of plants, species, size, proposed numbers and densities.
- (g) Implementation and maintenance timetables. The development shall thereafter accord with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design of the drainage basin, within the public open space.

14. Notwithstanding the approved landscaping, prior to occupation of any of plots 8-12 a scheme of planting for the shared amenity areas adjacent to those dwellings and forming part of the landscape buffer to 'Bay', shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the additional planting approved shall be installed in tandem with the site wide landscaping approved by this reserved matters scheme, and maintained in accordance with the approved maintenance plan.

Reason: To ensure that the planting adjacent to Bay Farm shares a neighbourly relationship.

**Reasons for the Decision:**

- The proposed changes, since the 2019 refusal, to the design, layout, scale and appearance of the development has overcome the material reasons to object to the proposals.

- The presumption in favour of sustainable development indicates that the proposal should be granted. It would make a notable contribution to the housing land supply through the provision of 50 dwellings, including affordable units.
- The amenity of the surrounding land users would be safeguarded.
- The proposal would not cause harm to the character of Bay, or to the setting of Bay House, a non-designated heritage asset.
- The proposal would have an acceptable impact on residential amenity, highway safety, flooding and biodiversity.

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** [2/2019/1554/FUL](#)

**APPLICATION SITE:** Bleet Farm, Bleet Lane, Gillingham, SP8 5RG

**PROPOSAL:** Erect replacement dwelling, retain 3 No. parking spaces.

**Decision:** Approved, subject to conditions.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.  
Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly and only in accordance with the following approved drawings and details: 1707-L1C, 1707-L3C, 1707-L4D, 0035-CMS-DR-GF-GA-LA-2000 B, 0035-CMS-DR-GF-GA-LA-2002 A, 0035-CMS-DR-GF-SP-LA-2001; forming the approved application.  
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to clarify the permission.
3. Notwithstanding the materials schedule shown on the approved drawing 1707-L4D and prior to the construction dwelling above damp proof course level, samples and details of all external facing materials for the walls and roofs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.  
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.
4. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and detailed Tree Constraints Plan prepared by a qualified tree specialist providing comprehensive details of construction works in relation to trees that have the potential to be affected by the development must be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Council. All works must be carried out in accordance with the approved details. In particular, the method statement must provide 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;
  - 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 work conforming to BS3998;
  - d) details of the area for storage of materials, concrete mixing and any bonfires;
  - e) details of any no-dig specification for all works within the root protection area for retained trees;
  - g) details of the supervision to be carried out by the developer's 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.

5. Notwithstanding the details of the approved drawing 0035-CMS-DR-GFGA-LA-2000 B, all tree planting shall be planted to a minimum height of 3 metres and must be carried out in full during the first planting season (October to March) following the substantial completion of the development. The planted scheme must be maintained in accordance with the agreed details. Following the implementation of the soft landscaping works, written confirmation of these works shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of ensuring the long term visual amenity and character of the area.

6. Prior to the commencement of development above damp course level, a schedule of landscape maintenance covering a minimum period of fifteen years following substantial completion of the development (including details of the arrangements for its implementation) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The subsequent maintenance of the development's landscaping shall accord with the approved schedule.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by the proper maintenance of existing and/or new landscape features.

7. The protected species mitigation proposals set out in the approved NET Biodiversity Mitigation & Enhancement Plan, prepared by Enzygo Ltd, dated 18th December 2019; shall be undertaken in full before the development hereby approved is first brought into use and shall be maintained in the approved condition permanently thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate habitat is provided and protected to accommodate protected species

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification) no enlargements or alterations including any changes to the external finishes of the dwellinghouse hereby approved, permitted by Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order, shall be erected or constructed.

Reason: To protect amenity and the character of the area.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification) no garages, sheds or other outbuildings permitted by Class E of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order shall be erected.

Reason: To protect amenity and the character of the area.

10. No external lighting shall be erected or installed at any time other than in accordance with details that have been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include drawings showing the appearance, siting, technical details, orientation, intensity and screening of any lamps.

Reason: To protect the character of the surrounding landscaping.

11. Prior to the installation of the glazing on the dwelling hereby approved, details of the proposed glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include a specification that the glass is non-

reflective. The development shall be completed out in accordance with the agreed details and shall be permanently maintained thereafter with the non-reflective glass.

Reason: To minimise light spill/pollution and protect the character of the surrounding landscape.

12. Blackout blinds shall be installed and permanently maintained on the glazing in the north-west elevation of the dwelling hereby approved. Each blind shall be fully closed at dusk each day and remain fully closed during hours of darkness. The blinds shall be operated by timed proximity sensors, which shall be kept in full working order at all times. Details of all blinds, their material (which shall be fully opaque) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development is carried out above slab level.

Reason: To protect the character of the surrounding landscape.

### **Reasons for the Decision**

- The proposed changes to the design, its re-siting away from the north western boundary as well as the screen planting/landscaping would ensure that the proposed replacement dwelling would appear no more visually intrusive in the landscape than the existing dwelling
- It is considered that the concerns of the previously refused application have been overcome.
- It is considered the amended proposal and accompanying landscaping scheme would meet criteria a - f of Local Plan policy 28: Existing dwellings in the countryside.
- The proposed replacement dwelling would not cause significant harm to the character of the surrounding rural landscape and would comply with the North Dorset Local Plan Policies 4, 24 and 28 and Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan Policies 24 and 25.
- The proposal would have an acceptable impact on residential amenity, highway safety and biodiversity.

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 2/2018/0372/OUT

**APPLICATION SITE:** Land at Pond Walk, Stalbridge, Dorset

**PROPOSAL:** Develop land by the erection of 9 No. dwellings. (Outline application with all matters reserved).

**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 three 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: 2611-P-03 REV D forming the approved application. Only the location plan part of this plan is approved.

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

5. Prior to commencement of any development on site a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface water drainage must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, no part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until the approved scheme has been fully implemented.

Reason: To minimise the risk of flooding and/or pollution.

6. The biodiversity mitigation measures set out in the approved Biodiversity Mitigation & Enhancement Plan submitted by KJF Consultancy Ltd and signed off 11.10.2019 by Dorset Council Natural Environment Team; shall be implemented in full in accordance with the timetable set out in the report, or in the absence of a specific timetable, prior to the development hereby approved being first brought into use and the site shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved mitigation proposals.

Reason: To ensure adequate habitat is provided and subsequently protected to ensure adequate protection for important habitats and species is secured.

7. No development above damp proof course level shall take place until a detailed scheme to enable the charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations within the development has been submitted and approved in writing with the local planning authority. The scheme shall include a timetable for implementation. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with such details as have been approved by the Local Planning Authority including the timetable for implementation.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made to enable occupiers of and visitors to the development to be able to charge their plug-in and ultra-low emission vehicles.

8. No development shall commence until details of the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site

9. Before the development is occupied or utilised 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 2 'Dorset Highways' 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.

10. The development hereby permitted must not be occupied or utilised until a scheme showing precise details of the proposed cycle parking facilities is submitted to and approved in writing the Local Planning Authority. Any such scheme requires approval to be obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme must be constructed before the development is commenced and, thereafter, 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

11. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised a Construction Method Statement (CMS) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMS must include:

- \* the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- \* loading and unloading of plant and materials
- \* storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- \* delivery, demolition and construction working hours

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

Reason: to minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network.

12. Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) prepared by a qualified tree specialist providing comprehensive details of construction works in relation to trees that have the potential to be affected by the development must be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Council. All works must be carried out in accordance with the approved details. In particular, the method statement must provide 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;
- 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 work conforming to BS3998;
- d) details of the area for storage of materials, plant, concrete mixing and any bonfires;
- e) 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;
- f) details of any no-dig specification for all works within the root protection area for retained trees;
- g) 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.

### **Reasons for the Decision**

- Absence of 5 year land supply
- 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 location is considered to be sustainable
- The principle of development for 9 dwellings would have an acceptable general visual impact and preserve the character and appearance of the Stalbridge Conservation Area and other heritage assets
- 9 dwellings can be developed on the site without any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- There are no other material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 2/2019/1678/FUL

**APPLICATION SITE:** Yewstock College, Sturminster Newton, DT10 1EW

**PROPOSAL:** Erect perimeter security fence and matching gates, 2.33 metres high  
Exempla welded steel wire mesh panels

**Decision:** Approved, subject to conditions.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.  
Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

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

Additional Security Fencing - P101 A [Received 06/02/2020]

Fencing Elevations - P102 [Received 06/02/2020]

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

3. All existing trees and specimen plants shown on approved plan P101 A to be retained, shall be fully safeguarded during the course of site works and building operations. All trees to be protected on and immediately adjoining the site shall be protected from damage for the duration of works in accordance with BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to construction - recommendations) or any new Standard that may be in force at the time that development commences. No unauthorised access or placement of goods, fuels or chemicals, soil or other material shall take place within the tree protection zone(s). Any trees or specimen plants removed without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority, or dying or being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased before the completion of development shall be replaced with trees or specimen plants of such size and species in a timescale and in positions as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that trees and specimen plants to be retained are adequately protected from damage to health and stability throughout the construction period and in the interests of amenity.

**Reasons for the Decision**

- 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 proposal is acceptable in its terms of its siting and external appearance.
- The proposed development would not compromise neighbour amenity.

- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Dorset Council

### **Covid-10 Pandemic – Addendum to the Guide to Public Speaking Protocol for Planning Committee meetings – effective from 20 July 2020**

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the council has had to put in place measures to enable the council's decision making processes to continue whilst keeping safe members of the public, councillors and council staff in accordance with the Government's guidance on social distancing by applying new regulations for holding committee meetings from remote locations.

The following procedures will apply to planning committee meetings until further notice, replacing where appropriate the relevant sections of the Guide to Public Speaking at Planning Committees:

1. While planning committee meetings are held remotely during the Coronavirus outbreak public participation will take the form of written statements (and not public speaking) to the committee.
2. If you wish to make a written statement it must be no more than 450 words with no attached documents and be sent to the Democratic Services Team by 8.30am two working days prior to the date of the committee – i.e. for a committee meeting on a Wednesday written statements must be received by 8.30am on the Monday. The deadline date and the email contact details of the relevant democratic services officer can be found on the front page of the committee agenda. The agendas for each meeting can be found on the Dorset Council website  
<https://modern.gov.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/mgListCommittees.aspx?bcr=1>
3. During this period the council can only accept written statements via email and you should continue to bear in mind the guidance in the public speaking guide when preparing your representation.
4. The first three statements received from members of the public for and against the application (maximum six in total) will be read out together with any statement from the town and parish council, by an officer (but not the case officer), after the case officer has presented their report and before the application is debated by members of the Committee. It may be that not all of your statement will be read out if the same point has been made by another statement and already read to the Committee. This is to align with the pre-Covid-19 protocol which limited public speaking to 15 minutes per item, although the Chairman of the Committee will retain discretion over this time period as she/he sees fit. All statements received will be circulated to the Committee members before the meeting.
5. This addendum applies to members of public (whether objecting or supporting an application, town and parish councils, planning agents and applicants).
6. Councillors who are not on the Planning Committee may also address the Committee for up to 3 minutes by speaking to the Committee (rather than submitting a written statement). They need to inform Democratic Services of their wish to speak at the meeting two working days before the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

## 1.0 **Application Number** – [2/2019/0318/OUT](#)

**Site address** - 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).

**Applicant name** - ELT Bournemouth Ltd

**Case Officer** – Robert Lennis

**Ward Members** –Cllr Sherry Jespersen

Taking account of the comments made by the Parish Council, the Head of Service considers that under the provisions of Dorset Council's constitution this application should be determined by the Area Planning Committee.

## 2.0 **Summary of Recommendation:**

Delegate authority to Head of Planning to **GRANT** permission subject to a s.106 agreement to address:

- 40% affordable housing
- Community leisure and indoor sports facilities
- Primary school contribution
- Secondary school contribution
- Formal outdoor sports
- Formal outdoor sports maintenance
- Informal outdoor space
- Informal outdoor space maintenance
- Multi use games area
- Destination Play maintenance
- Local Area of Play (LAP)
- Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP)
- Rights of Way contributions/enhancements
- Allotments (onsite provision & maintenance)

and the conditions (and their reasons) listed at the end of the report.

## 3.0 **Reason for the recommendation:**

- 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

- The development would secure economic and social benefits
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application

#### 4.0 Table of key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	The principle of development is considered to be acceptable in light of the lack of 5 year housing land supply and location adjacent to the settlement boundary.
Loss of Agricultural Land	The loss of this relatively small parcel of land in the context of the existing use, provision of housing and social/economic benefits is considered to be acceptable.
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	The application is outline for access consideration only. However an illustrative masterplan demonstrates that it will be possible to respect the character and appearance of the area.
Affordable Housing and s.106 planning obligations	The scheme will deliver a 40% policy compliant level of affordable housing and a plethora of other policy compliant infrastructure contributions.
Access	The proposed vehicular access into the site is from Haywards Lane and is afforded adequate visibility splays.
Transport	There will be no adverse impacts and the proposed development will deliver a beneficial school pick up/drop off area for the adjacent school.
Landscape	There will be negligible impact upon the setting of the AONB.  There will be a small loss of existing hedgerow on the site boundary and within the site. However, some relocation, and additional tree planting can mitigate against this loss.
Impact on Heritage	There are no heritage assets within 300m of the site and the lack of intervisibility will result in no harm to their significance.



Residential Amenity	The amenity of adjacent residents can be protected by providing adequate space, respectful orientation between proposed and existing properties, and further tree/hedge planting on boundaries.
Flooding/Drainage	The site is wholly in Flood Zone 1 (low risk). Surface water drainage details can be adequately secured by condition.
Ecology	Full surveys have been undertaken and impact upon protected species can be mitigated to avoid adverse effects.
Economic benefits	Benefits would come from the provision of jobs during construction, future residential expenditure and the New Homes Bonus.

## 5.0 Description of Site

The application site consists of two parcels of land measuring circa 1.31 hectares (ha) and is located on the western edge of Child Okeford. Child Okeford is identified as one of the 'larger' villages within North Dorset. The larger villages are those with a retained settlement boundary and have been identified as areas for future growth – due to the sustainability credentials of each settlement and the need to meet local housing needs.

The site sits to the north of Haywards Lane (forming the sites southern boundary). The sites northern and eastern boundaries are made up of established residential developments consisting of a mix of pre-war, 40's, 50's, and 60's dwellings. The properties are made up of detached properties (those located within Allen Close) terraced and semi-detached properties (those to the immediate north of the site) located in Greenway and Chalwell. The area to the north of Station Road (the area of Child Okeford situated to the east of the application site) is made up of detached properties within a series of cul-de-sacs.

The site is classed as Grade 2 agricultural land, which is currently used for small scale equestrian purposes and is laid to grass. It has well-established hedge lines running along the site boundary and through the centre of the site. The western site boundary is an established field boundary made up of hedging and a number of mature trees. There are two specimen trees within the site, a mature oak tree (subject to a TPO) lying in the boundary between the two parcels, and a large mature walnut tree situated on the eastern boundary, just north of Allen Close. Both of these trees will be retained in the proposals. The site is mainly flat with a slight slope from West to East.

The site lies outside of any defined settlement boundary and does not have any site specific designation. It is not within a Conservation area and there are no listed buildings within its setting. The nearest listed building is a Grade II 'Pilgrims Farm' approximately 300m to the East along Station Road. Hambledon Hill which lies approximately 800m metres to the east of the village is a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

There is an important view identified in the Child Okeford Village Design Statement which runs through the site out to open countryside through Allen Close.

The site is situated within flood zone 1 (being the lowest risk of flooding).

The site falls outside of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but within the North Blackmore Rolling Vales character area and partly within the Clay Vale character area as described in the North Dorset Landscape Character Assessment (as amended) (2008).

## **6.0 Description of Development**

The application seeks outline permission (with only access for consideration) to erect up to 26, two storey properties, in a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom properties. The current proposals have been reduced by 6 dwellings from an initial proposal of up to 32 dwellings. It is proposed that the development will be served by a single vehicular access point and pedestrian crossing from Haywards Lane. A parking area for school drop offs/collection with 20 spaces will be provided adjacent to the access and at the closest point to the school entrance.

The applicant has submitted a draft s.106 Agreement/Heads of Terms which would provide the policy compliant 40% affordable dwellings on site and the full range of necessary planning obligations (outlined below).

The indicative layout demonstrates that a policy compliant level of parking can be provided for the proposal. Cycle parking details will be secured by condition.

The site provides an area of circa 0.31 ha of open space and retains the footpath which enters the site from Allen Close and runs to the western site boundary. 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.

The existing perimeter hedges are retained, save for the area where the access is proposed, and the proposed open space allows for the retention of the centrally located feature Oak tree.

## **7.0 Relevant Planning History**

There is no relevant planning history associated with the site.

## **8.0 List of Constraints**

Agricultural Land Grade - Grade: GRADE 2

Parish Name - : Child Okeford CP

Ward Name - Ward Name: Hill Forts Ward

## **9.0 Consultations**

### **Child Okeford PC**

Consulted on the 8 October 2019, comments were received on the 05 May 2020, 28 May 2020, and 02 June. The comments which set out numerous objections to the proposals can be summarised as follows;

- Changes to the planning application not publically advertised
- Premature application in advance of the next local plan
- Application lacks detail and clarity
- Inconsistent approach to other sites promoted in the village
- Loss of agricultural land
- Object to any housing on this site as it outside of the settlement boundary
- Unsustainable location for development
- Excessive distance to the village centre
- Insufficient evidence of local need
- Out of character with the local area
- Lack of assessment on residential amenity impacts
- Overshadowing caused by trees in proposed gardens
- Contrary to the Child Okeford Village Design Statement
- Impact upon protected species
- Infrequent bus services and heavy dependence on private cars
- Insufficient pedestrian access
- Excessive speeding vehicle on Haywards Lane and increased risk of accidents
- Increased parking pressures on the St Nicholas School and nearby residential roads
- No guarantees that the school parking area will be convenient and utilised by parents
- Conflict with agricultural vehicles
- Applicant looking to take financial advantage by way of an excessive development

- Local healthcare infrastructure already stretched with a high percentage of older people
- Detrimental impact to the AONB
- Light pollution
- Increased colour and signage
- Setting a precedent for further development
- Inaccurate Flood Risk Assessment
- Increased Flood Risk and inadequate provision for surface water drainage
- Lack of s.106 agreement

### **Urban Design**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, their comments dated 11 July 2019 are as follows:

No objection, however raises several areas of concern with regard to the indicative layout;

- The quality of the link through to Allen Close would be severely compromised with dwellings backing onto the footpath (plots 29-32). Development in this form would also create front / rear issues with built form to the north.
- Parking spaces at junction heads should be avoided
- Plot size disparities should be revisited

### **Landscape Architect**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, their comments dated 06 November 2019 are as follows:

Objection based on the following issues;

- Proposed density of 30 dwelling per hectare is out of character compared to the prevailing rural village density of between 10-20 dph.
- One of the key characteristics of Child Okeford is its low density of housing interspersed with significant tree planting. I anticipate that this element of the local landscape character will be degraded by the introduction of a sizeable sub-urban scale development on land that is beyond the main village settlement.
- It would be preferable to see some (if not most) of the existing hedge that crosses the site being retained, as this would provide immediate visual screen and softening of the development.

**Transport Development Management**

Consulted on the 13 March 2019, their comments 21 April 2020 are as follows:

No objection, subject to conditions.

**Drainage Flood Risk Management**

Consulted on the 14 May 2019, their comments dated 04 April 2019 are as follows;

No objection, subject to conditions.

**Wessex Water**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, their comments dated 06 November 2019 are as follows:

No objection, WW will undertake a review of the foul sewer network and we will undertake any necessary network improvements to provide foul capacity for permitted development. Developers fund the cost of connecting to the public sewer on a size for size basis and Wessex Water fund any necessary network reinforcement from infrastructure charges income.

Surface water flows to be disposed of in accordance with Suds Hierarchy and NPPF Guidelines. The Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy (Paul Basham Assoc. Oct 2019) proposes to discharge surface water to an existing ditch at a restricted rate, using infiltration techniques, attenuation and a flow control device. We leave the Lead Local Flood Authority to comment on surface water arrangements and associated flood risk measures.

There is a 250mm public water main in Haywards Lane. A water supply can be made available to the proposed development with new water mains installed under a Section 41 application.

**Natural Environment Team**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, their comments dated Mon 08 Apr 2019 are as follows;

No objection, subject to adherence to the Biodiversity Mitigation Plan certificate.

**Tree Officer**

Consulted on the 02 July 2020, their comments 08 July 2020 are as follows;

No objections, subject to conditions.

**Dorset Education Authority**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, their comments dated 09 April 2019 are as follows;

No objection, subject to securing financial contributions for primary and secondary schools.

**Planning Obligations Manager**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, their comments dated Mon 08 Apr 2019 are as follows;

No objection, subject to Education obligations being secured by s.106.

**Dorset Police Architectural Liaison Officer**

Consulted on the 13 March 2019, their comments dated 21 March 2019 are as follows;

Recommendation that the security of the development meets the standards laid out in Secured by Design Homes 2019. This is the Police guidance on crime prevention and security in new developments and will assist with the sustainability of the development. [www.securedbydesign.com](http://www.securedbydesign.com)

**Housing Enabling Team**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, their comments dated Mon 08 Apr 2019 are as follows;

No objection, subject to 40% affordable housing being secured on site.

**Principal Technical Officer**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, there was no response from this consultee at the time of report preparation.

**Rights Of Way**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, there was no response from this consultee at the time of report preparation.

**NHS**

No objection, subject to financial contributions.

**North Dorset CPRE**

Consulted on the 13 Mar 2019, their comments dated 30 September 2019 are as follows:

Objection for the following reasons;

- The level of housing applications in North Dorset being excessive

- Difficult access, poor visibility and inaccurate traffic surveys
- Unsustainable site poorly served by public transport
- Inappropriate design
- Pressure on Infrastructure
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- Serious risk of flooding

## **10.0 Representations**

59 letters of representation were received, of which 5 offered comments which neither supported nor objected to the proposal, 54 objected to the proposal and 0 supported the proposal.

Neutral comments;

- The site is a better alternative to the Beehive storage site - details
- Request for a higher percentage of affordable housing

Objections;

- Unsustainable location
- Housing need not demonstrated
- Development does not constitute a rural exception site
- Contrary to the Child Okeford Village Design Statement (2007)
- Inappropriate density
- Out of Character
- Loss of privacy
- Noise impact, loss of tranquillity
- Loss of biodiversity/hedgerows
- Impact upon protected species
- Surface water drainage issues
- Localised parking issues
- Highways safety concerns
- Pedestrian safety concerns
- Traffic surveys taken in school holidays and therefore inaccurate
- Proposed pedestrian footpath requested is on third party land
- Impact upon local infrastructure, particularly roads, the school and the GP surgery
- Limited local employment opportunities

## 11.0 Relevant Policies

### North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (January 2016):

Policy 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
Policy 2 - Core Spatial Strategy  
Policy 3 - Climate Change  
Policy 4 - The Natural Environment  
Policy 6 – Housing Distribution  
Policy 7 - Delivering Homes  
Policy 8 - Affordable Housing  
Policy 13 - Grey Infrastructure  
Policy 14 - Social Infrastructure  
Policy 15 - Green Infrastructure  
Policy 20 - The Countryside  
Policy 23 - Parking  
Policy 24 – Design  
Policy 25 - Amenity

### National Planning Policy Framework:

As far as this application is concerned the following sections of the NPPF are considered to be relevant

1. Introduction
2. Achieving sustainable development
4. Decision-making
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
11. Making effective use of land
12. Achieving well designed places
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### Other Material Considerations:

### North Dorset Landscape Character Assessment (as amended) (2008).

The site straddles two Landscape types; Clay Vale and Rolling Vales, although the majority of the site lies within the Rolling Vales Landscape Type, which is described as: - *“An undulating transitional area between the low lying vales and the high Chalk, with clay and greens and landform becoming gradually more enclosed, folded and twisted nearer the escarpment to form a series of rolling foothills. There is an abrupt level change between this area and the steep sides of the escarpment but towards the vales, the land flattens out gradually. It is*



*mainly a pastoral landscape with a few arable fields on flatter land interspersed between improved pasture and meadows. There are many small brooks, streams and damp flushes with numerous scattered hamlets and farms. The whole area has a tranquil, secluded and undeveloped character and feel to it”.*

The overall management objective for the Rolling Vales Landscape Type should be to conserve and enhance the diverse pattern of trees and woodland, hedgerow and small scale fields, watercourses and narrow lanes. The conservation of the rural and tranquil nature of the area is also a key objective.

### **Child Okeford Village Design Statement (COVDS) SPD (2007)**

- Part 3 The character of the landscape setting
- Part 8 Guidelines for Future Building and Development
- Part 10 Recommendations

## **12.0 Human rights (standard text)**

Article 6 - Right to a fair trial.

Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life and home.

The first protocol of Article 1 Protection of property

This Recommendation is based on adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.

## **13.0 Public Sector Equalities Duty**

As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have “due regard” to this duty. There are 3 main aims:-

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people
- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove OR minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the PSED.

<b>Benefit</b>	<b>Quantum</b>
Affordable housing	40% on site
Community leisure and indoor Sports facilities	£2006.97 per dwelling for any or all of the following;  a. Regeneration of the Child Okeford Community Centre  b. the Child Okeford Recreation Ground Improvement project  c. provision of and enhancement/replacement of the existing village hall and/or the refurbishment/extension of the sports pavilion
Formal outdoor sports	£1,318.80 per dwelling
Formal outdoor sports maintenance	£128.73 per dwelling
Informal outdoor space	£2,152.80 per dwelling
Informal outdoor space maintenance	£1,278.80 per dwelling
Multi use games area	£967.52 per dwelling
Destination play maintenance	£359.36 per dwelling
Primary school	£64,356 for improvements enhancements and/ or extensions to St Nicholas CE VA Primary School
Secondary school contributions	£130,465.00 for improvements enhancements and/ or extensions Sturminster Newton High School
Local area of play (LAP)	On site
Local equipped area of play (LEAP)	On site
Rights of way	£10,000/resurfacing of newly dedicated

	footpath from Netmead Lane which is to the north of the Development and links in to the Bridleway N35/20 onto Hayward Lane near Green way.
Allotments	308 sqm of allotment land within the development & £308.16 per Dwelling towards provision of and upkeep of the allotment outside of the site.
Construction Jobs	Provided for approximately 1-2 years
Council Tax Revenue	Generated by up to 26 dwellings
New Homes Bonus	

## 15.0 Planning Assessment

- Principle of development
- Loss of agricultural Land
- Affordable housing
- Access and sustainable location
- Design and landscape
- Biodiversity
- Amenity
- Flooding and drainage
- Infrastructure provision
- The planning balance

### Principle of Development

Policy 2 of NDDC local plan part 1 requires development to be located in accordance with the spatial strategy which directs development to the 4 main towns and larger villages. Child Okeford is identified as one of the 18 'larger villages' as a focus for growth to meet local needs.

The site is located immediately adjacent of the settlement boundary. In policy terms the site is within the 'countryside' and development would normally be strictly controlled, unless it is required to enable essential rural needs to be met.

Policy 20 Countryside reiterates this and lists two criteria where development would be appropriate outside defined settlement boundaries, a) the type of development set out in local plan policies or b) there is an overriding need for it to be in the countryside.

Section 8 of the Child Okeford Village Design Statement provides guidelines for the 'Setting and Structure for Future Building and Development' and states that

one of its main objectives is to concentrate development within Settlement Boundaries as identified in the Local Plan's Proposals Maps. Under part 10 (recommendations) it states 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 proposal is therefore contrary to these policies as it is outside the settlement boundary for Child Okeford, not specifically for essential rural needs and there is no overriding need for it to be in the countryside.

Whilst the site lies outside of the settlement boundary, it nevertheless lies adjacent to it and close to existing residential properties. It represents an opportunity to 'round off the settlement'. It is located within walking distance of a school, a church, a doctor's surgery, two village pubs, a community hall and an adjacent primary school. The village is served by the bus service X10 which provides links to Sturminster Newtown (identified as one of the four main towns), a bus stop is located on Hayward Lane adjacent to the site. Whilst it is acknowledged that there are relatively limited local services, the site is also not considered to be isolated and overall can be considered a sustainable location.

The site was identified and included by North Dorset District Council in the 2012 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), ref – 2/11/0/02. It states in the comments that the site has 'potential to reflect the adjacent estate' and that the site has longer term potential for an estimated 25 dwellings. Whilst this does not constitute planning policy, nor a formal site allocation, it does indicate the Council's view as to the potential acceptability of the principle of residential development, subject to appropriate detailed design.

The NPPF requires local authorities to identify and update annually a five year supply of specific deliverable housing sites. Currently Dorset Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land. In the area that was North Dorset DC, has only a 4.0yr housing land supply.

Accordingly, Footnote 7 of the NPPF confirms that the relevant housing policies of the development plan should be considered out of date. Paragraph 11d) states that where the relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.

The Framework seeks to encourage residential development in sustainable locations. The proposed dwellings would be located within reasonable proximity to facilities and services, and contribute towards housing supply and choice, but also deliver some economic benefits to the local economy notably through short term construction.

In this case, despite some conflict with local plan policies, when the appeal scheme is assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, there are no adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits derived from the proposal.

### **Loss of Agricultural Land**

The site is identified as Grade 2 agricultural land, defined as 'the best and most versatile'. The land that would be lost as a result of the proposal is relatively small in the context of the area administered by the Council. Nevertheless it is a finite resource and its loss should be considered carefully. The following considerations are important in weighing its loss.

- The site does not form part of a larger farm, which could otherwise affect the viability of an existing agricultural enterprise.
- The site is currently used for small scale equestrian purposes and has not been used as agricultural land since 2017.

The loss of this land in the context of the provision of housing and social/economic benefits is considered to be acceptable. The proposed development is therefore acceptable in principle.

### **Affordable Housing and s.106 planning obligations**

The scheme will deliver a 40% policy compliant level of affordable housing. This would amount to the provision of 10 no. homes on site and 0.4 as an offsite financial contribution. The Housing Enabling Officer considers that by providing 40% affordable dwellings with a tenure split of 70/30 affordable rent/shared ownership this development would make a valuable contribution to meeting the affordable provision across the North Dorset area. Studies show that the need in North Dorset is largely for affordable rented or social rented housing and this high level of housing need is reflected by the current number of households registered on Dorset Home Choice as being in housing need which is over 960 households.

There would be a clause in the s.106 Agreement restricting the occupation of these affordable homes to a 'local needs person'. This is defined as;

*'a person or persons in Housing Need (together with immediate family and dependents of such a person) who are registered on the Council's Housing Register and have a Local Connection as confirmed in writing by the Council or in the case of Shared Ownership Units as confirmed in writing by the Approved Provider;'*

The affordable element would be secured in perpetuity by a S106 agreement and should weigh favourably in the planning balance.

The applicant has also agreed to make all of the requested contributions (set out in section 14 above) which also weigh favourably in the planning balance.

These will be secured by s.106 legal agreement and are considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

### **Access and highway safety**

The application is for outline planning and seeks consideration and permission for access only. The access is proposed on the Southern boundary of the site approximately 20m to the West of the St Nicholas Primary School entrance on Haywards Lane. The access is 6m wide and is afforded adequate visibility splays.

There is a proposed parking area provided to the East of the access providing 20 car parking spaces for school drop off and collections. This is a matter which weighs in favour of the proposal and can be considered a local highway benefit. The operation of this parking area will need to be maintained for the use of school drop off/pickups and a management details will be conditioned to ensure it remains free for use at appropriate times.

There is a proposed pedestrian crossing point which is provided off this car park area and provides passage to a tactile crossing point on the other side of the road and safe access into the village centre along well maintained pavements (approx. 700m). It has been confirmed that the land on which the crossing is located is wholly within public ownership and the highways department have no objections.

Policy compliant parking provision can be achieved on this site and cycle storage details will be secured by planning condition. The highways department have no objections to the proposals. Excerpts from their consultation response state that;

*'The submitted Transport Statement has been fully considered and the trip generation predictions contained within it are accepted as being appropriate and robust for both pedestrians and vehicles.'*

*'The conclusion reached, which is accepted by the Highway Authority, is that the impact would be minimal and certainly not sufficient to warrant a refusal recommendation.'*

*'the Highway Authority is of the opinion that there are no highway safety issues presented by the proposal that can be recognised to be "severe", when consideration is given to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - February 2019.'*

## **Design and Landscape**

The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, a Landscape Appraisal, a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and an illustrative site layout drawing.

Whilst the layout is merely illustrative at this stage, it provides assurance that there is sufficient space to ensure that the character and distinctiveness of the locality can be respected. The public open space provided around the feature Oak, the retained Walnut tree, the space for good sized gardens, the space between dwellings, the retention of the majority of established trees/hedgerows, and opportunity for further tree planting all serve to ensure the development will soften its impact successfully on the village edge and integrate the development into its surroundings.

The initial proposals for up to 32 dwellings were considered to be unacceptable owing to the density at 25dph, the suburban nature of the proposal and the impact upon the character of the local area.

The applicant was asked to reduce the density of the proposals and duly obliged by reducing the proposals to 'up to' 26 dwellings. The amendments made to the application were not publically advertised. The Parish Council raised objections on this matter. However there is no statutory duty for the local planning authority to undertake further consultation on amendments made after applications are submitted. It is up to the LPA to make a balanced judgement. It was considered that the changes would have reduced the impact of the development. It was clear that immediate neighbours were aware of the changes being made with several additional representations made regarding such changes. All representations have been taken into account in the formulation of this report and nobody has been deprived of the opportunity to make representations.

It is now considered that the proposed development can link well to the existing housing nearby in terms of scale, type and density and will have limited effect on the perception of the village as rural in character. The reduced density on the site at 20 dwellings per hectare (dph) is marginally above the existing densities in the vicinity, Chalwell 17 dph, Greenway 15 dph and Alan Close 12 dph.

However there is now a local and national policy requirement to make effective use of sites, especially in areas with a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs. In fact the NPPF goes further than this and states that decisions should specifically avoid proposals built at low densities. Officers consider that an acceptable balance has been reached in this proposal which will respect the rural character and tranquil nature of the area whilst providing an appropriate quantum of market and affordable dwellings.

Although the site lies close to the AONB boundary (approx. 250m) there is very limited intervisibility between it and the AONB except for very long distance views

from the top of Hambledon Hill. The view from Hambledon Hill will remain largely unchanged. The LVIA states that the only element of the proposed development that would be visible would be a slight increase in the number of roofs that are visible. This view would only be perceptible if using binoculars or a camera zoom to increase the view. The conclusion is that the magnitude of effect is low owing to the distance involved, the breadth of the view, and the presence of intervening properties and vegetation. Therefore this development would have a neutral impact upon the significance of Hambledon Hill, Scheduled Ancient Monument, and negligible impact upon the setting of the AONB .

### **Heritage**

The site is not located within the Child Okeford Conservation area or its setting. The CA lies 300 to the East. There are no listed buildings adjacent or within its setting. The nearest listed building is a Grade II 'Pilgrims Farm' approximately 300m to the East along Station Road. There will therefore be no impact upon local heritage assets given the significant separation distances and lack of intervisibility.

### **Residential Amenity**

The site is only visible from three adjacent residential dwellings. Wynchards on the corner of Haywards Lane and two properties, no's 5 & 6 at the eastern end of Allen Close. Other properties that may have an oblique view of roofs include 13 & 14 Chalwell. The properties in Greenway are only single storey and therefore unlikely to have any oblique views.

There will be an inevitable change to the nature of the site, with increased vehicular movement and domestic noise and activity. However this is unlikely to adversely impact adjacent neighbours to the extent that would warrant the refusal of this application.

The amenity of adjacent residents would be protected by providing adequate space, respectful orientation between proposed and existing properties, and further tree/hedge planting on boundaries.

### **Flooding and drainage**

The site is within flood zone 1 and therefore has a minimal risk of surface water flooding.

A detailed drainage assessment and layout has been submitted with the planning application. This has been scrutinised by the Councils drainage engineer and no subsequent objections have been raised.

### **Biodiversity**

Extended Phase 1 ecology surveys have taken place and a report submitted with the application. Further ecological surveys will be required prior to any works starting on site. The Dorset Natural Environment Team have been consulted and



the application is accompanied by a Biodiversity Mitigation & Enhancement Plan and an approved and signed Biodiversity Mitigation Plan Certificate. This will ensure that the following mitigation measures take place;

- Further bat surveys
- Minimised lighting on site
- New hedgerow and hazel translocation to the Eastern boundary
- Further native tree species and fruit tree planting
- Public open space grassland
- Oak & Walnut Tree retained and all other retained trees/hedgerows to be protected during construction
- Any clearance of hedgerows to only take place between September-November to avoid the breeding bird season.
- Two bird nesting boxes
- One bat tube in each property
- Hedgehog corridor
- Wildflower lawn mix

In light of these mitigation and enhancement measures biodiversity and protected species will be adequately safeguarded.

## **16.0 Conclusion**

There is conflict with the development plan, by reason of the effect of the proposal on the Council's spatial strategy and location of the proposed development outside a settlement boundary.

However the authority cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply and so the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. In accordance with paragraph 11 d) of the Framework, as directed by Footnote 7, policies which are most important for determining the application are considered out-of-date, and subsequently planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Given this shortage of housing land supply the 'tilted balance' would apply. This is where the need to boost housing land supply is prioritised when weighing up the planning balance for proposals.

There will be substantial social and economic benefits and some minor environmental benefits weighing in favour of the proposal;

- Provision of upto 16 market and 10 affordable dwellings for local people in a location directly adjacent to a settlement boundary
- Short term construction jobs
- Increased resident spending and support for local services
- New homes bonus payments

- Increased tree planting
- Biodiversity enhancements

It is important to note that there are no adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh these benefits; there are no fundamental concerns with regard to the following topics;

- Loss of agricultural land
- The setting of the AONB
- Heritage assets
- The character of the area
- Residential amenity
- Highways
- Flood risk/Drainage
- Trees/Hedgerows
- Ecology/protected species

Therefore in this case there are no considerations of specific policies in the NPPF that weigh against the balance towards housing provision and officers recommend that the application should be approved without further delay.

## 17.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

Recommendation A: Delegate authority to Head of Planning to **GRANT** permission subject to a s.106 agreement to address:

- 40% affordable housing
- Community leisure and indoor sports facilities
- Primary school contribution
- Secondary school contribution
- Formal outdoor sports
- Formal outdoor sports maintenance
- Informal outdoor space
- Informal outdoor space maintenance
- Multi use games area
- Destination Play maintenance
- Local Area of Play (LAP)
- Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP)
- Rights of Way contributions/enhancements
- Allotments (onsite provision & maintenance)

and the conditions (and their reasons) listed at the end of the report.

Recommendation B; Refuse permission for failing to secure the obligations above if the agreement is not completed by (30 January 2021) or such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning.

## 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.

12. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, a Travel Plan must be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The Travel Plan shall include:

- o Details for the ongoing operation of the school pick up parking area; and
- o Effective measures for the on-going monitoring of the school pick up/drop off parking area

The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan.

Reason: To ensure that the school drop off/pickup area is kept free for use at the appropriate times.

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.

This page is intentionally left blank



**1.0 2/2019/1316/REM - 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).

**Applicant name:** Drew Smith Homes And Homes England

**Case Officer:** Robert Lennis

**Winterbourne North Ward, Member(s):** Andrew Kerby

**2.0 Summary of Recommendation:** Grant permission subject to conditions

**3.0 Reason for the recommendation:**

- 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.

**4.0 Table of key planning issues**

**This must include all those headings which will then be discussed in full in the Planning Assessment section**

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	Established through planning applications 2/2017/1706/VARIA and 2/2015/1269/OUT
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	Scale and design are acceptable, impact would be positive as the site is

	currently vacant.
Impact on amenity	No seriously adverse impact.
Impact on landscape or heritage assets	Positive, no objections.
Economic benefits	Benefits would be accrued through development employment and increase in population.
Access and Parking	No objections from the Local Highway Authority subject to conditions.
Flood risk	No objections from the EA or the Lead Local Flood Authority subject to conditions.

## 5.0 Description of Site

The development site (aka The Brewery site) is located to the north east of Bournemouth Road in Blandford St Mary and to the south of the town centre of Blandford Forum and the River Stour.

An area of public open space is located to the north east and residential development fronting Bournemouth Road and at The Old Stable Yard is located to the south western boundary of the site. It is situated approximately 450 metres north west of the junction of A350 and the A354.

The total outline planning application site (ref. 2/2017/1706/VARIA) extended to 3.3 hectares and historically formed part of the larger Brewery complex. In 2009, the owner of the site (Hall & Woodhouse) secured planning permission for a new modern brewery building and the land subject of the outline planning permission was surplus to requirements of the modern Brewery operation. This Reserved Matters application is the first phase of the residential redevelopment of the site and extends to 1.26 hectares.

The site is located wholly within the Blandford Blandford St Mary and Bryanston Conservation Area. A detailed analysis of the impact development would have on the site and heritage assets was contained within the outline planning application submission documents. This detailed reserved matters scheme has had regard to the Design Code, and Guidance of the outline applications. Its impact on heritage assets is explained and set out in section 4 of the accompanying Design, Access and Heritage Statement.

The site is not located within a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) but is located 150m to south east of the Dorset AONB and 550m to the west of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB.

The site would be accessed via the historic Brewery access point from the Bournemouth Road. The primary access to the application site has been

constructed and proposal for phase 1 would take its access from that primary route into the site.

## 6.0 Relevant Planning History

Application: 2/2017/1706/VARIA

Proposal: Develop land by the erection of residential development, comprising a mix of new buildings and restoration, extension and conversion of existing brewery buildings. Modify existing / create vehicular / pedestrian access points, access roads and car parking; ancillary engineering and other works including drainage proposals, raising ground levels, landscaping and elevation changes to existing brewery and commercial buildings - outline application with access to be approved for whole site, together with scale, layout and appearance for the restoration, extension and conversion of existing brewery buildings for residential use and for elevation changes to existing brewery and commercial buildings (demolish existing buildings). (Outline application to determine access).

Proposed amendment to condition wording to allow a phased approach for delivery of demolition and development works.

Application to vary (i) Condition 4 in relation to the approved drawings insofar as they relate to the development of the rear wing of the existing brewery building, (ii) Conditions 3, 6-13, 20, 23-28 & 30 insofar as they relate to the triggers for commencement of works in relation to the phased delivery of demolition, development and occupation, as described in the applicant's submitted document "Planning Conditions Schedule ref 2/2015/1269/OUT - Proposed Amended Wording", and (iii) updated plan or report references in conditions 14, 22 and 26.

Decision: Approve

Decision Date: 29.05.2018

Application: 2/2015/1269/OUT

Proposal: Develop land by the erection of residential development, comprising a mix of new buildings and restoration, extension and conversion of existing brewery buildings. Modify existing / create vehicular / pedestrian access points, access roads and car parking; ancillary engineering and other works including drainage proposals, raising ground levels, landscaping and elevation changes to existing brewery and commercial buildings - outline application with access to be approved for whole site, together with scale, layout and appearance for the restoration, extension and conversion of existing brewery buildings for residential use and for elevation changes to existing brewery and commercial buildings (demolish existing buildings). (Outline application to determine access).

Decision: Approve

Decision Date: 17.02.2017

## 7.0 List of Constraints

Conservation Area - The Blandford Forum Conservation Area  
Conservation Area - The Blandford St Mary and Bryanston Conservation Area

EA Flood Defences - Description: Defences  
Floodzone Type: Flood Zone 2  
Floodzone Type: Flood Zone 3

Parish: Blandford St. Mary CP  
Settlement Boundary: Blandford Forum

## 8.0 Consultations

(Full comments from Consultees can be found online: <https://planning.north-dorset.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage> )

### *Blandford Forum Town Council*

Objects - The Town Council notes the modifications but still objects to the application due to the lack of a LEAP play area, with children having to cross a road or river to get to the nearest one. There is also a lack of access for disabled vehicles.

### *Blandford St Mary Parish Council*

The following notes are based on the presented planning application documents - REF 2/2019/1316/REM. Although this application relates to reserved matters, we note that outline planning only has been granted.

1 Density of housing: The density of development proposed is achieved at the expense of public open space/amenities which will not encourage the nurturing of a local community. In our view this is over development with a lack of sufficient parking which is likely to disputes.

2 Boundary issues: It is noted that a neighbouring property although having discussed ongoing access to their property for maintenance this aspect appears to have been overlooked. We would support this neighbour in ensuring this long established access to maintain their property is retained.

3 Parking: The parking allocation for the site indicates 101 spaces of which 4 are designated as disabled. The location of the disabled spaces does not offer nearby parking for Block 4.

It is highly likely that each dwelling may have two cars, or a proportion of dwellings will have visitors, which leaves a short fall of 25 cars. This offers a

potential for unauthorised parking on this site with the corresponding risk of blocking access for emergency vehicles with consequences for the residents. Similarly residents vehicles maybe parked elsewhere raising the prospect of it being someone else's problem.

In terms of EV charging for parking in general, and the limited number of DDA spaces, the potential for being unable to charge vehicles is not a very socially responsible approach.

4 Amenities/play areas: We cannot see any play/amenity areas on this site which precludes children "playing near to home". Are there any dedicated cycle ways on this site?

5 Emergency vehicle access: See parking above  
Note this aspect will impact similarly on refuse collection vehicles.

6 Environmental Impact: Whilst we agree the disposal of surface water will not impact the local area any more than from previous use, the apparent lack of PV or any other "green" energy provision suggests a lack of forward thinking that could impact on the neighbourhood.  
We have assumed that the water authority is content with the added sewage disposal volumes generated by this site.

7 Infrastructure: We note there is a sub-station allocated for the site. Does this sub-station and the infrastructure incorporate full capacity to the dwellings to have "zero carbon" heating which would imply electric heating as there is no facility for PV (photovoltaic) cells on any of the roofs.  
In addition the number of EV charging points and their subsequent impact on the local distribution may impact on the primary installation.

8 Security: The site appears to be open to public and offers a route from the suspension bridge to Bournemouth Road. We would suggest the inclusion of CCTV be provided and perhaps the Police and the local community may have a view on this aspect.  
In addition external lighting is not apparent which would form part of the general security and ambiance of the development.

#### *Bryanston Parish Council*

1. BPC objected to the 2017 variation application (2/2017/1706/VARIA) by letter dated 13 January 2018. The concerns expressed were:

- the lack of infrastructure;
- the lack of a joined-up transport consideration with other nearby developments, namely: 61 new houses at Dorchester Hill (now built), up to 80 houses at Lower Bryanston Farm (now granted subject to S106 agreement: and the 180 dwellings proposed at the Brewery Site.

2. The current application has submitted details of reserved matters for the 63 new-build dwellings on the western half of the site - less than half of the overall area. The details relate to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.

3. The details do not address the concerns previously expressed by BPC in January 2018. In addition, splitting the site into two parts now means that it is very difficult to gain any overall picture of how the site as a whole is to be developed.

4. Looking at the submitted details it is evident that the scheme has been significantly 'economised' in visual and conservation area terms. The reasons for this are not clear from the application, but are likely to relate to cost.

5. The original and variation applications were presented in the context of a detailed Design Guidance and Design Code for building layout, form, scale and design. An examination of the current submitted drawings demonstrates a variety of ways in which the design has been simplified:

- housing layout and scale parameters have changed, and there is a noticeably simpler pattern of houses, with 3 open developments (formerly 2 enclosed and 1 open);
- the 'mews' concept (Mortain Mews) has been lost, with no closure of street and bridge views;
- a lack of natural surveillance along the top of Stour Street, again contrary to the approved Design Code and Guidance;
- the road alignment on the A1 / A1H houses has been straightened;
- the detailed design now submitted is very simplistic, and reminiscent of any standard residential estate development.

The recent amendments have only partially addressed these concerns.

6. In summary, the proposals markedly change the whole ambience of the development. A unique design and development opportunity is potentially lost for this part of the Conservation Area, and the resulting development is likely to be a significant disappointment, in particular as there is no indication about the rest of the site, including the conversion of the retained brewery building

#### *Blandford Ward*

The application is outside the Blandford Forum boundary, in the parish of Blandford St Mary. The Town Council previously objected to the application due to insufficient parking, community facilities and play area and there only being one single road in and out of the development. The amendments to the application did not address any of the issues and therefore the application was only noted.

Objection under the following grounds: totally inadequate parking allocations and the home sizes seem to be socially unacceptable. It is felt that it is an overdevelopment of the site and the Parish Councillors expressed concerns over the access onto Bournemouth Road. Also the matter of ensuring that the sewage services are adequate to deal with the increase of houses in the village was of concern.

*Environment Agency*

- No objections subject to conditions.

*Historic England*

- No comment.

*Drainage Flood Risk Management*

- No objection.

*Transport Development Management*

- No objections.

*Tree Officer Majors*

- No objections.

*Planning Obligations Manager*

- No objections.

*Conservation Officer*

- No objections subject to conditions.

Representations received

(Full comments from representation can be found online: <https://planning.north-dorset.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage> )

Two representations were received: 1 objection, 1 support.

Concerns have been raised with regard to the boundary treatment to the rear of 3 The Old Stables.

Blandford & District Civic Society are generally supportive of the proposal.

## **9.0 Relevant Policies**

### **North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 2011-2031 (adopted January 2016)**

Policy 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 2 – Core Spatial Strategy

Policy 3 – Climate Change

Policy 4 – The Natural Environment

Policy 5 – The Historic Environment  
Policy 6 – Housing Distribution  
Policy 7 – Delivering Homes  
Policy 8 – Affordable Housing  
Policy 13 – Grey Infrastructure  
Policy 14 – Social Infrastructure  
Policy 15 – Green Infrastructure  
Policy 16 – Blandford  
Policy 22 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy  
Policy 23 – Parking  
Policy 24 – Design  
Policy 25 – Amenity

**National Planning Policy Framework:**

As far as the application is concerned, the following sections of the NPPF are considered to be relevant:

1. Introduction
2. Achieving sustainable development
4. Decision-making
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
6. Building a strong, competitive economy
8. Promoting healthy and safe communities
9. Promoting sustainable transport
11. Making effective use of land
12. Achieving well designed places.
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Note: NPPF paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This states, in part, that ‘Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. ... For decision-taking this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay...’

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or



ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

#### *Current housing land supply*

The Council at present can only demonstrate 4.0 years of housing land supply of the requisite 5.0 years of housing land supply as set out in the NPPF. North Dorset District Council published its latest Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) last year:

<https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning-policy/north-dorset/additional-planning-policy-documents/annual-monitoring-report-development-stats/pdfs/annual-monitoring-report-2019-final.pdf>

#### *Other policy and guidance:*

Historic England (HE): Setting of Heritage Assets

HE: Conservation Principles

HE: Streets for All Guidance

BS7931: Conservation of Historic Buildings

#### **Statutory Duties (upon the LPA):**

##### *Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004:*

Section 38(5), If to any extent a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published (as the case may be).

Section 38(6), If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

##### *Town and Country Planning Act 1990:*

Section 197: It shall be the duty of the local planning authority – (a) to ensure, whenever it is appropriate, that in granting planning permission for any development adequate provision is made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees; and (b) to make such orders under section 198 as appear to the authority to be necessary in connection with the grant of such permission, whether for giving effect to such conditions or otherwise.

##### *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*

Section 66 (1) General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions: In considering whether to grant planning permission ...for development

which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority... shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 (1) General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions: In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, ... special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

## **10.0 Human rights**

Article 1 - Protection of property

Article 6 - Right to a fair trial.

Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life and home.

This Recommendation is based on adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.

## **11.0 Public Sector Equalities Duty**

As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have “due regard” to this duty. There are 3 main aims:-

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people
- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove OR minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the PSED.

## **12.0 Planning Assessment**

The main issues of the case are considered to relate to:

- Principle of development and affordable housing
- Highway safety
- Flood risk
- Matters of design: Layout, Appearance, Scale
- Landscaping
- Heritage impact
- Neighbour amenity
- Other matter raised by local Councils

### *Principle of development and affordable housing*

The principle of development was established through the outline applications 2/2018/1269/OUT and then 2/2017/1706/VARIA. These applications

The outline planning permission (2/2017/1706/OUT) was/is subject to 30 planning conditions. These include that the details of the reserved matters (the 'layout', 'scale', 'appearance' and 'landscaping') are all to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) before development commences (condition no.3). Further conditions require the details of other elements of the scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by DC before development can commence.

The outline planning permission is also subject to a Section 106 Agreement dated 17th February 2017 and a subsequent Deed of Variation to that original agreement dated 11 January 2019. The two agreements provide planning obligations to deliver:

- Affordable Housing provision of 5 shared ownership dwellings delivered in Phase 2 or 3 of the development;
- The transfer of Stour Meadows to the Council;
- The provision of a Local Area for Play (LAP) and a financial contribution towards its construction and future maintenance.
- To provide a Public Art Scheme and financial contribution for delivery.
- The provision of temporary conference facilities made available for Blandford St Mary Parish Council within the Hall & Woodhouse Brewery site.

This reserved matters application forms Phase 1 of the development comprising 63 dwellings to the north west of the site. The new housing to be delivered in will consist of: 4no. 1 Bed Apartments, 19no. 2 Bed Apartments, 11no. 2 Bed Houses, 29no. 3 Bed Houses.

The Deed of Variation to the original S106 agreement dated 11 January 2019 altered the Affordable Housing requirements associated with outline planning permission 2/2017/1706/VARIA. The obligations now require an Affordable Housing Scheme to deliver 5 shared ownership dwellings in phase 2 or phase 3 of the development. This current Reserved Matters application is for phase 1 of the development and is therefore not legally required to deliver any Affordable Housing.

Notwithstanding the lack of obligation on phase 1 to deliver Affordable Housing, Homes England have an interest in the site and are working with Drew Smith Homes with the intention to bring on-board an affordable housing provider to deliver an element of affordable homes within this phase. However, this is not a requirement that can legitimately be secured through planning condition but is

something that would be delivered by Homes England and Drew Smith Homes outside of the planning process.

### *Highway safety*

The Highway Authority has noted that "... points previously raised have been satisfactorily addressed by the revised drawings, in particular the need for all of the proposed units along Stour Street to be set back 0.5m to avoid protrusion of foundations, rainwater goods and 1st and 2nd floor windows into Stour Street. It is considered that the internal estate road layout, although not to be offered for adoption under s38 of the Highways Act, is deemed to be safe for all road users." Subject to the same conditions previously recommended for 2/2017/1706/VARIA no objections would be raised.

The conditions that relate to highway matters previously imposed (conditions 24-30) will remain in force for each phase of development.

### *Flood Risk*

In order for this application to be acceptable it must adequately address Condition 17 of 2/2017/1706/VARIA. The EA has noted that the proposal would raise ground levels (by up to a metre in places) between the development site and the dry side of their flood embankment.

For reference, Conditions 17 stated:

*17. There shall be no new buildings, structures (including gates, walls, fences or similar barriers) or raised ground levels within: (a) 8.000 metres of the top of the bank of the river adjacent to the site or, (b) 8.000 metres of any side of an existing culverted watercourse inside or along the boundary of the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Environment Agency.*

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

Whilst the EA would prefer to see no ground raised to the rear of the embankment, they have raised no objection to address their concerns at a later date by way of conditional approval. In particular, the conditions should address:

- The developer must provide proposals to ensure the continuation of and full functionality of the existing french drain arrangement that runs adjacent to the dry side of the embankment. For information, please see the attached drawing A160/08/02/006A showing the existing drainage. This drainage system must not, under any circumstances, be used to accommodate the general site drainage.

- The developer must provide details showing construction / compaction design and methodology for the infilling, that will have no detrimental impact to the condition and integrity of the existing embankment. Material placement and compaction must be carefully undertaken without the use of heavy machinery tracking across our embankment. The finished ground must be suitably top-soiled and seeded to a similar specification to the existing.
- The developer must commit to providing a before and after condition survey (including levels and photographs) of the existing (pre development) embankment, and remaining (post development) exposed embankment.
- As previously requested, the developer must provide details of any proposed fencing, and a suitable gate (lockable) arrangement.

The Lead Local Flood Authority has considered the applicant's Drainage Strategy & Water Quality Management (DS&WQM) Report (ref: AKS Ward - S198062-BFB-XX-XX-RP-C-0001\_P02, dated 06/12/2019) and relevant plans. They have noted that the wider site falls partially within Flood Zones 2 & 3 (medium / high risk of fluvial flooding) according to the Environment Agency's (EA) indicative floodplain modelling and is defended by an EA maintained Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS). The wider site is shown by relevant mapping to be at some (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding. However this would likely be isolated ponding during severe rainfall events.

The LLFA acknowledge that the current consultation / application relates specifically to Reserved Matters and does not infer any approval of detail design, or discharge of relevant planning conditions (ref: 23 - 2/2017/1706/VARIA). On this basis the LLFA has no objection in respect of the current application for Reserved Matters, relating to Phase 1.

### *Matters of design*

#### *- Layout*

There is no objection in principle to the streetscene, it recognises the importance of the entry gateway points into the site and aims to develop a link, with what is locally known as "the blue bridge" across the Stour, and into the town. It also utilises the main driveway entrance into the former brewery site and a related application has dealt with the adaptation of the gate piers and roadside wall, to meet Highways requirements, while maintaining the historic design and detail.

During the course of the application Officers had concerns with regard to the orientation of the outer perimeter buildings, in terms of turning their back on the development which would result in amenity space enclosures being visible within the development itself, and concern was raised over the need to ensure the design, materials and finish of these was of appropriate character and quality to respect the former commercial/industrial and historic significance of the

undesigned heritage asset(s) and its setting. However, justification was provided in that the outward facing facades, are employed in response to the prominence of the site from the important town meadows (a public open space that makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area) and as such need to be safeguarded.

- *Scale and appearance*

There is no objection to the scale and mass of the proposed building, as the precedent is set for such with the existing large scale brewery building, and the service, non-domestic quality of the site. The warehouse form employed for the main element of the development is in-keeping with the historic setting. Similarly the design of the dwellings has maintained a generally non-domestic appearance. The use of brick is supported with detailing in both contrasting materials and alternative brick colour.

Member may be interested to know that Officers have advised on a number of points which have been addressed or will be addressed by way of conditions seeking detail. In particular, Officers have secured or will be seeking through condition:

- corbelling at eaves – as seen on the existing brewery;
- blind window and door panels where large expanses of black walls exist;
- use of painted timber for inset areas instead of grey brick on some of the buildings to add colour and lighten the building's appearance to avoid the appearance of an excess of brick and rather heavy and oppressive character to the site. This should also take reference from the existing brewery;
- articulation and materials of windows and doors need to have regard for the Brewery and historical detail/design/form:
- were recognised as not having traditionally style dormers, string courses, bay windows and some of the windows were inappropriate in this sense and entrance points to the larger buildings weak and insufficient focal points.
- modern soldier courses to be avoided at all cost with arched headers favoured.
- detailed window material and colour to be considered (note: that UPVc is not considered a sufficiently quality material for such a major development or such prominent position and with both a heritage and sensitive natural setting), there is an expectation that windows will be timber or powder coated aluminium in the context of this site.
- use of two tones of red brick, to reduce the massing impact, emphasise features such as quoins, arches, string course and plinths;
- detailing of design to integrate the flat roofed design of porches.

Since the above guidance points were provided to the applicant, revisions have been undertaken as regards the overall detailing of the scheme, which has taken many of the points on board and developed the scheme with the introduction of

added features. Therefore in the majority of dwellings design, officer support is forthcoming.

The use of mineral fibre slates (artificial slate) is not supported for roofs or slate hanging to walls or dormer cheeks, within a heritage setting. In the context of this site, natural slate is required preferably with traditionally fixed with nails. Materials need to be conditioned to address this matter.

The gable ends of House Type A1 and A2 (plot nos.17 and 23) have an extensive wide blank gable end. In the historic context of this site, it is recommended that these elevations are broken up visually possibly with blind openings, brick banding or figures introduced to the upper half to break up monotony. This could be conditioned accordingly notwithstanding the details on approved plans.

A 'solid to void' ratio in conservation areas is often an important consideration. With this in mind, Gatehouse G "Bournemouth" roadside elevation has been amended to reduce the glazing. This dwelling will be adjacent to Bournemouth Road and the proposed wall and gate piers are a nice feature for the streetscene that will draw the eye so it was important to get this right; see drawings 10838-PL206D elevation and 10838-PL156B plan.

The Apartment Block1 will have fine detailed brick work and this can be seen on plan 10838-PL241. The proposed two colours of brick shown will draw this quality. There will be a mix of brick colours throughout the development as can be seen on the elevation drawings. Choice of materials, including colour of bricks, is the subject of bespoke condition listed below.

Rainwater goods are described as black UPVC, this would not be acceptable in the historic context. Notwithstanding any approved drawings, rainwater goods and other external ductwork should be conditioned to agreed design and material.

Details of the window arches, cills, and door heads to dwellings could be improved upon. Officers would prefer to see a lighter coloured brick that takes reference from that detail on the Brewery building and a stone cill colour on the window and door heads to dwellings to provide continuity on site. These can be addressed by way of a bespoke condition.

### *Landscaping*

The arboricultural assessment, and the means for managing those trees on site that are to be retained, are sound. The recommended measures are sufficient to ensure any collateral damage is kept to a minimum and, in particular, the

requirement for a predevelopment site meeting, which would be key to the success of the measures detailed here.

From a landscape point of view, Officers are in broad agreement with the general approach, and the layout of the proposed planting all seems to work well in conjunction with the scale, mass and design of the built form. The use of “natural” forest scale trees on the perimeter of the site, coupled with related cultivars within the site, helps carry that thread of countryside through what’s a deliberately urban setting.

There were a number of suggested changes to species selection which the applicant has taken on board and issued amended plans for, and plans have been annotated to use an appropriate soil cell system for tree adjacent to hard surfacing.

The hard landscaping details annotated on plan (m330-303 P7) are considered to be sufficient to insure a high quality development. In particular, the use of brick walls, coping stones, and various paving material demonstrate the quality of development.

#### *Heritage impact*

In addition to this site being in The Blandford Blandford St Mary and Bryanston Conservation Area, there are a number of listed buildings in the vicinity and non designated heritage assets. Policy 5 of the LPP1 and Section 16 of the NPPF direct us to consider the impact of development on heritage assets such as these.

As set out above, the proposed layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping details of this application are considered to be acceptable and of a high quality. Having due regard to the heritage assets associated with this site, it is officer opinion that the proposed details would have a neutral or beneficial impact on the relevant these assets. It could be considered beneficial due to the fact that site is largely vacant at present, and because the buildings that were removed were utilitarian in nature.

#### *Neighbour amenity*

The site has a limited amount of shared boundary. Consequently the layout and scale of the proposal has raised few concerns with regard to neighbour amenity. Officers did go on site to consider the layout and relationship with existing properties. There would be no overlooking and no overly dominant relationship with any neighbouring properties that would result in a detrimental impact.

One concern that had been raised with maintenance of a neighbouring property (3 The Old Stables) but this is a civil matter. Nonetheless, as a matter of good



practice Officers considered the issue onsite and found that there was sufficient space to erect scaffolding within the neighbours property.

#### *Other matters*

The development of this site has been the subject of several applications and the original scheme has changed slightly as have the contributions secured through the Section 106 legal agreement. This has led to repeat comments on the principle of development.

The comments received from Blandford Forum Town Council, Blandford St Mary Town Council, and Bryanston Town Council, have been taken into account as follows:

6th November 2019 – Blandford Town Council – Objection

- *Inadequate Parking* – A Parking Provision Note and Dorset Parking Requirement Calculation have been submitted demonstrating that the scheme provides parking in accordance with the Council's parking standards. Dorset Highways have raised no objection on this matter.

- *Inadequate Community Facilities and Play Area* – The requirement for community facilities and a play area was considered at the grant of outline planning permission under applications 2/2015/1269/OUT and 2/2017/1706/VARIA and is not subject to further consideration at this RM stage.

- *Inadequate access into the development* – The access into the site has been approved via the outline planning permission (2/2015/1269/OUT and 2/2017/1706/VARIA) and subsequent Homes England Discharge of Condition Application 2/2018/0850/DOC.

11th November 2019 – Blandford St Mary Parish Council – Objection

- *Inadequate Parking* – A Parking Provision Note and Dorset Parking Requirement Calculation have been submitted demonstrating that the scheme provides parking in accordance with the Council's parking standards. Dorset Highways have raised no objection.

- *Socially unacceptable home sizes* – All dwellings meet at least the minimum space standards set nationally and therefore the suggestion that the home sizes would be socially unacceptable should not carry weight.

- *Overdevelopment* – The proposed RM application applies general principles as shown in the illustrative masterplan as consented at the outline application stage. The proposed number of homes (63no.) is some way under the total consented scheme total of 180 units and is not considered an overdevelopment. Though it is accepted that additional units may come forward

on the other phases of development, this site is the lion's share of the overall site and it is at the discretion of the Council to monitor this matter on future phases.

- *Access concerns onto Bournemouth Road* – The access into the site has been approved via the outline planning permission (2/2015/1269/OUT and 2/2017/1706/VARIA) and subsequent Homes England Discharge of Condition Application 2/2018/0850/DOC.
- *Ensure sewage services are adequate to deal with increase in houses* – A scheme identifying the foul drainage arrangements is submitted with the planning application. No objections have been received from Wessex Water.

17th December 2019 – Blandford Town Council – Objection

- *Reinforced previous objection from the 6th November 2019* – Response as per above

10th February 2020 – Motcombe Parish Council (it is assumed this was meant to be Bryanston PC) – Objection

- *Density/Overdevelopment* – The proposed RM application applies general principles as shown in the illustrative masterplan as consented at the outline application stage. The proposed number of homes at 63 is some way under the total consented scheme total of 180 units and is not considered an overdevelopment. Though it is accepted that additional units may come forward on the other phases of development, this site is the lion's share of the overall site and it is at the discretion of the Council to monitor this matter on future phases.
- *Neighbouring boundary concerns* – The matter has been investigated and considered by officers; see above neighbour amenities.
- *Inadequate Parking* – A Parking Provision Note and Dorset Parking Requirement Calculation have been submitted demonstrating that the scheme provides parking in accordance with the Council's parking standards. Dorset Highways have raised no objection.
- *Lack of amenity/play areas* – The requirement for community facilities and a play area was considered at the grant of outline planning permission under applications 2/2015/1269/OUT and 2/2017/1706/VARIA and is not subject to further consideration at this RM stage.
- *Access for emergency and service vehicles* – Vehicle tracking plans have been submitted with the application and no objections raised by Dorset Highways
- *Environmental Impact* – This is an 'in principle' concern which would have been considered at the grant of outline planning permission under applications 2/2015/1269/OUT and 2/2017/1706/VARIA and is not subject to further

consideration at this RM stage. It is noted by the applicant that all buildings will achieve Building Regs standards through good quality building fabric.

- *Sub-station infrastructure* – The sub-station will serve the development site in its entirety, not just this phase of development.
- *Security and requirement for CCTV* – There is no requirement for CCTV and public access through the scheme would be covered by natural surveillance from the dwellings through design and layout.

5th March 2020 – BFTC – Objection

- Reinforced previous objection from the 6th November 2019 – Response as per above.

12th March 2020 – Bryanston Parish Council – Objection

- Repeats objections from 2017/2018 regarding a lack of infrastructure and wider transport considerations – Response regarding infrastructure as per the above. The transport implications from the development of 180 units on the site was considered at the outline planning application stage and is not subject to further consideration at this RM stage.
- *Concerns regarding phased approach* – Outline planning permission 2/2017/1706/VARIA accepted that the site could be developed in phases as per the description of development.
- *Concerns regarding visual and heritage impact* – Comments from the Conservation Officer support the proposal subject to conditions. The proposed development has been submitted with a Planning Statement and DAS which explains comprehensively the design approach and the relevance of responding positively to the scale, design and character of the Brewery.
- *Criticism regarding compliance with the Design Code and Design Guidance* – The proposed RM application applies general principles as shown in the illustrative masterplan as consented at the outline application stage. The submitted DAS reflects on how the scheme responds positively to the Design Code and Design Guidance.

## **13.0 Conclusion**

With the principle of development established through outline applications along with details of access, this reserved matters seek to establish details relating to layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping. The applicant has made amendments to the proposed development broadly in keeping with the comments of Conservation Officer and Landscape Officer. No objections have been raised by the Highway Authority or the Flood Authority subject to conditions. The concerns of the Town and Parish Councils, and representations,

have been considered and addressed. It is Officers opinion that the proposed details of this development accord with the development plan. As such, it is considered that subject to conditions this proposed reserved matters application should be approved.

The conditions list below have been agreed with the applicant.

## **14.0 RECOMMENDATION**

Subject to the following conditions, grant approval of reserved matters,

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.

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

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.