

Public Document Pack



DORSET COUNCIL - NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 15 SEPTEMBER 2020

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

Also present: Cllr Tony Alford, Cllr Graham Carr-Jones and Cllr David Walsh

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

Brian Convery (Locum Property Lawyer), Mike Garrity (Head of Planning), Robert Lennis (Area Lead (Major Projects) Eastern), Simon McFarlane (Area Lead Planning Officer, Gillingham), Steve Savage (Transport Development Manager), Allison Sharpe (Business Support Officer), Hannah Smith (Planning Area Manager), James Weir (Conservation Officer), Huw Williams (Lead Project Officer - Corporate Projects), Jackie Witt (Planning Technical Officer), Judy Saunders (PA to Chairman and elected members), Hayley Caves (Member Development and Support Officer) and Fiona King (Democratic Services Officer)

1. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Ridout for the afternoon session only.

2. Declarations of Interest

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

With regards to Item 5a, Cllr Fry declared an interest in respect of predetermination as his wife works at Dorset County Hospital. Cllr Fry undertook to not take part in the debate and agreed to speak only as a Local Member for this item.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2020 were confirmed and signed.

4. 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.

5. **Planning Applications**

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

6. **WD/D/19/002627, Dorset County Hospital, Williams Avenue, Dorchester, DT1 2JY**

Cllr Fry spoke as the Local Member only and then removed himself from the meeting for this item.

The Lead Project Officer introduced the application for the erection of a multi storey car park and improvements to internal site roads and temporary change of use of former school field to car parking and Dorset County Hospital.

The officer identified the whole hospital campus and drew members' attention to the main access points on the site. The location and extent of the Dorchester conservation area was highlighted and it was noted that no development was planned in the designated conservation area. The nearby Listed Buildings were also highlighted. The proposed site plans and the proposed elevation and section drawings were highlighted to members.

There was no in principle land use objection and the main considerations in the determination of the application were set out in the application report.

The officer highlighted a number of updates for members since the publication of the report which included:-

- A review of screening under the EIA Regulations, environment impact was not considered necessary and the original screening opinion considered to be sound.
- Further consultation responses from the Council's Transport Planning Manager and Flood Risk Management Team:
 - The Travel Plan was now acceptable.
 - Surface water discharge element objection was still not resolved and this was explained to members.
- Representations in support of the proposed development had been received from Richard Drax MP and Simon Hoare MP. 6 further representations supporting the proposed development had also been received including previous county councillor and representative on the Hospital Board, Ian Gardner.
- Further representations objecting to the proposed development included a petition from the residents of Damers Road. Further representations had also been received expressing concern about air quality impact and damage to properties during the construction period.

The Conservation Officer had no further comments to make.

The Transport Development Liaison Manager highlighted that on-site parking provision would be increased to 1064 spaces once the works were completed.

The view from the Highways Authority was that the proposed development was satisfactory and robust and had no objection in principle to the proposal.

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

Cllr Tony Alford who was the Dorset Council representative on the hospital Board addressed the committee. He focussed on the concept of heritage significance and noted that it was not clear from the report that Historic England had set any guidance about how heritage should be discussed. He felt this was missing from the Planning Officer's report. He concluded from the report there would be a very low level of harm arising from the proposed development. There was a high level of compliance with other areas of the application. Sustainable development was mentioned in the report, and this application would help to deliver all three elements. He highlighted that approval of this application would ensure the funding of £62.5m for the hospital was secure.

Local Members for Dorchester West – Cllr Les Fry

Cllr Fry highlighted that this application was contentious for a number of reasons but felt this could be avoided. He felt the point on conservation was not relevant as there were plenty of building nearby that did not compliment the town. Whilst he did have sympathy for the residents the hospital needed to adapt and expand. He felt that the multi-storey car park would stand out but not as much as the buildings on Poundbury. He had worked with the Hospital Estates Team to try and sort a number of parking issues on the current site. He asked if the hospital had taken into account COVID and the number of people that were now working from home and if the car park was still needed. Cllr Fry made reference to the water issues and solar panels and asked for a condition to be added that local people had a say in what the final building would look like.

Members comments and questions

In respect of the question regarding staff working from home at the hospital, the officer advised that he had had some discussion with various people, and on occasions when he had visited the car park had not had any difficulty parking but recognised this was not the finding of other people. With reduced visitor numbers he felt there may have been a noticeable reduction in parking demand during the COVID period. However, he felt that planning decisions should not be taken on the basis of what remained an emergency situation.

With regards to the incorporation of renewable energies, the officer advised there were no proposals within the application for onsite renewable generation, but later noted that the photovoltaic cells are proposed on the roof of the service cores. In terms of climate change impact the proposals for providing a car park with electric vehicle charging points and a commitment to green travel was a positive element to the application.

Cllr Jones asked if there were any specialist reasons to consider in order for members to go against the officers' recommendation. The officer advised that

the decision members were being asked to take involved balancing the harms that had been identified by council officers against the public benefits claimed by the applicants and that are acknowledged in the application report. There was nothing in the report that invited members to put weight to issues that were not material planning considerations. The recommendation for refusal related to the landscape, townscape and visual impacts of the proposed multi storey car park and related implications for designation of heritage assets. The committee can and should have regard to the public benefits associated with the proposed development. Members should not approve unless they were satisfied that the harm to the significance of designated heritage assets was clearly and convincingly outweighed by the public benefits.

Cllr Taylor asked if a sprinkler system was planned for the building. The officer advised any such system would be covered under building regulations.

Cllr Andrews highlighted the social and economic benefits of the scheme and highlighted his experiences of trying to secure a disabled space when visiting the car park. He was content to proposed that the recommendation be refused.

Cllr Heatley felt the application was centred on 3 areas, parking, the future plans for the hospital and potential damage to heritage. He had no objection to the modest increase in parking capacity and felt in respect of the heritage and landscape, it was sometimes too easy to make too much of this.

Cllr Pothecary found the recommendations to be brave and exemplary. However, the word harm was subjective and she would vote to approve application. She asked that an informative be included regarding the objection raised by the Flood Risk Management Team.

Cllr Ridout noted that the development was large but was part of the site so would be viewed in context and was outside the conservation area. She appreciated there were heritage assets close by but there was distance. The proposed development was in the best location on the site and would be a huge benefit to staff, patients and visitors. It was important for the hospital to carry on increasing their green travel plan. In her view the public benefit far outweighed the harm.

Cllr Jones highlighted the £62.5m increased funding to the area which could not be taken lightly.

Following a vote, members agreed to grant planning permission for the multi-story car park at Dorset County Hospital.

The Lead Project Officer highlighted some headline conditions that members may wish to impose should they be minded to approve the application. Members discussed these and agreed to leave the detailed wording for the Head of Planning, to be agreed in consultation with the Chairman. The Chairman asked that a condition be included regarding the involvement of the community in the choice of design and artwork of the exterior of the building.

Cllr Ridout wanted to ensure that the proposal for planting 170 new trees off-site would go ahead and asked if that would be in the landscaping condition. The officer advised that he thought that this was included in the biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan, but could reasonably be secured by condition.

Proposed: Jon Andrews

Seconded: David Taylor

Decision

1. To grant planning permission on the grounds that the social and economic benefits in respect of parking and funding for the hospital outweighed the harm to the landscape, to visual amenity and to the significance of heritage assets. Members were satisfied that the harm to heritage significance was clearly and convincingly outweighed by the public benefits associated with the proposed development.

2. That the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman, agree the conditions.

3. That an advisory note be added regarding community involvement in the design and artwork of the exterior of the building.

7. 2/2020/0379/FUL, West of Shaftesbury Road at Land South of Gillingham, Shaftesbury Road. Gillingham

The Area Lead Planning Officer introduced the application for the construction of a principal street, associated access, landscaping and infrastructure works in Gillingham.

The officer highlighted the holding objection by the Environment Agency to members and explained why this featured in the recommendation.

He advised that the road had been designed as a tree-line road which would be 6.75m wide, widened at the bends, where necessary. There would be shared use footway/cycleways provided and therefore the Highways Authority fully supported the proposal.

Local Members for Gillingham

Cllr Walsh

Cllr Walsh addressed the committee and advised that he had been involved in the scheme for the past 8 years. He had seen this evolve over the years and noted that it was being led by the community. Previously, he had spoken in Parliament regarding this issue and highlighted that the funding was time limited. The residents of Gillingham designed and supported this development.

Cllr Potheary

Gillingham Town Council resolved to recommend approval of this application subject to pedestrian islands, to make crossing the road safer. Highways have stated that given the number of people wanting to cross the street there would only be a need to include dropped kerb crossing points and asked for their location with regards to footpaths. The officer highlighted them in his presentation. The Transport Development Liaison Manager noted that Dorset

Council had advised that there was no need for any controlled crossings along the principle street. It was felt to be safe to cross a 30mph road at that width and anyone using the Rights of Way footpaths should be safe to cross the road.

Cllr Ridout

Gillingham was fortunate to have received funding at the outset of the development and she felt that any impacts had been addressed and mitigated. The application had gone through a rigorous public consultation. She asked that the tree and landscaping detail be discussed and liaised with Gillingham Town Council.

Members comments and questions

Cllr Cook made reference to the link to the B3081 and asked if this didn't come to pass what would be the implications for buses coming down the street and would there be enough space for them to turn? The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that the road has not been designed with a turning head at the eastern end. The officer advised that the draft phasing plan illustrated that development would start at the Eastern end of the site and therefore it was highly likely that this connection to the B3081 would be provided in the early stages of development as the intention is that the link will be provided, most probably at the first phase of residential development. In the unlikely event that this connection was not delivered the Transport Development Liaison Manager added that there were always engineering solutions to any problems that might be encountered.

Proposed: Jon Andrews

Seconded: Belinda Ridout

Decision

That the application be approved subject to no adverse comment from the Environment Agency and the conditions outlined in the appendix to these minutes.

8. 2/2019/1710/REM, Land at E 373794 N 117227, Thornhill Road, Stalbridge

The Area Lead Planning Officer introduced the application for the erection of 60 No. dwellings, form public open space, local equipped area of play and attenuation pond. (Reserved Matters application to determine appearance, layout, landscaping and scale; and to discharge Condition Nos. 15 - Landscape Environment Plan, 17 - Soft Landscaping, 18 - Footpath Link, 21 - Materials Palette, 22 - Public Art and 24 - Lighting and Signage; following grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2017/1095/OUT).

The officer highlighted the proposed site layout and the layout specifics. The proposed development was a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bed houses and flats. There were no design constraints as the application was not in a conservation area.

There was a holding objection from the lead local flood authority in place. Conditions had previously been imposed on the outline application that prior

to commencement of development drainage matters had to be agreed. With these in place already this matter had been adequately addressed.

The key planning matters were highlighted – neighbour amenity and matters of design and layout.

The Transport Development Liaison Manager highlighted that the road layout complied with a speed limit of 20mph. Car parking was built in line with council guidance, the provision being all on-street. The Applicant had stated that the road would remain private and would not be offered for adoption.

A number of written submissions supporting and objecting to the proposal and a statement by the applicant were read out at the meeting and are attached to these minutes. One late representation was received raising concerns about boundary fencing adjacent to existing properties.

Local Member for Stalbridge – Cllr Graham Carr-Jones

As the portfolio holder for housing Cllr Carr-Jones was very pleased to have this 100% affordable homes development within his ward. He made reference to local chatter about the homes not being available for local people and explained to members how the housing register worked. He was still slightly disappointed with the design site layout. However, he was not asking for the application to be refused but asked that if there was anything in planning that could be done to mitigate the layout. He asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of the trees and lighting specifics. The Areas Lead Planning Officer advised that with regards to lighting the applicant would have to assign a management company to undertake maintenance and due care in the roads. In respect of tree management, condition 17 was around soft landscaping, and that the developer would need to notify Dorset Council for the first 4/5 years so the tree officer could go and see that it was all acceptable.

Members comments and questions

Cllr Fry asked about the size of the 2 bed houses and if they fitted with national criteria. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that officers could not enforce the size as this was guidance. In terms of renewable energy to make them climate change complaint, the officer advised that the applicant was not proposing any solar renewable element at the present time. It was sustainable by its location and would meet the building regulations. Following a question about how high the hedging would grow, the officer advised that this was set out in the landscape management plan submitted. The residents would be entitled to cut what was on their property but the Management Company would be responsible for this.

Cllr Jones asked if members could ensure a minimum maintenance standard of the road if they are not adopted. The officer confirmed that this would be the responsibility of the Management Company. The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that there was no obligation on the Highways Agency to check on comment on the road.

Cllr Penfold asked about the improvements to the footpath and what this would entail. The officer advised that typically the surface and links to the footpath would be tarmacked but there was no further work planned to the existing footway.

Cllr Hall asked why there was not more permanent fencing instead of hedging in the application. The officer advised that he had considered different types of fencing. Following a further discussion about the native hedging, the officer advised that the Tree Officers and Landscape Officers had raised no objections on this matter.

Cllr Andrews preferred the fencing and hedging proposal.

Proposed: Carole Jones

Seconded: Les Fry

Decision

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

9. **2/2018/1808/OUT, Land North of Burton Street, Marnhull, Dorset**

The Area Lead Planning Officer introduced the application to develop land at Marnhull by the erection of up to 61 No. dwellings, form vehicular and pedestrian access, public open space and attenuation basins. (Outline application to determine access).

The application had been originally determined by the former North Dorset District Council in 2019. However, the reason the application was before members was because there had been a change to the terms of the Section 106 Agreement, specifically the NHS contributions could not be secured and their request for contributions had been retraced. Therefore, members were now being asked to review the application and approve.

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

Local Member for Marnhull – Cllr Graham Carr-Jones

There has been broad acceptance that Marnhull could take some development, although the application had not been that popular. Parishioners would rather not have street lighting in the development, if they have to have something could it be sympathetic and considerate. He asked that a condition be added to the application that reduces the speed limit down to 20mph. The Transport Development Liaison Manager advised that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and Planning Permissions were governed by separate legal processes. He suggested that the normal procedure would be that the Parish Council would pursue a TRO with Dorset Council. He felt it was not particularly essential to this planning application. With regards to street lighting, the Area Lead Planning Officer advised that these details had

not yet been supplied and would be brought forward at the layout stage. However, the officer felt that the applicant would want to address this.

Members comments and questions

Cllr Cook made reference to the 40% affordable housing in this location and asked for details how much the NHS contribution would have been and if there was a way in asking for affordable housing to make up what the developer was going to give to the NHS. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that the Section 106 was legally binding and officers were unable to secure any additional contributions.

Cllr Fry asked about the consideration of renewable energies being included. The Chairman advised that this application was an outline application at the present time, more details would follow at a later date. The Area Lead Officer advised that he would add an informative on this matter.

Cllr Jones considered if members should be reviewing the other Section 106 monies as the original application was submitted in 2018 and approved in 2019. The Area Lead Planning Officer advised that this was specific to the NHS Trust as they had withdrawn their request for Section 106 money and then proceeded to this basis. It was not made clear what needed to be reviewed as this was a bespoke issue relating solely to the NHS Trust.

Cllr Potheary proposed approval of the application and that members did their 'best endeavours' to support Marnhull Parish Council in their plans for a TRO. Any comments members can make to support the Parish Council with the TRO would be useful.

Cllr Fry supported the comments regarding the TRO. He felt it was hard to enforce 20mph zones and asked if there were any other options that could be considered. The Transport Development Liaison Manager explained the work planned to make the bend wider to avoid instances of speeding round corners. It was the role of the Police to support the TRO. In respect of traffic calming, this required lighting and signage and there would be issues of where it would be located, and they were not usually placed in isolated areas.

Proposed: Val Potheary

Seconded: Les Fry

Decision

1. That the application be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the appendix to these minutes and a S106 legal agreement, without NHS contributions.
2. That Marnhull Parish Council be supported in their endeavours to obtain a 20mph speed limit.
3. That an informative be added regarding the inclusion of renewable energies.

10. Urgent items

There were no urgent items of business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 3.37 pm

Chairman

.....

Written Submissions

Tuesday 15 September 2020

Item 5a – Dorset County Hospital, Williams Avenue, Dorchester, DT1 2JY

Tim Goodson and Dr Forbes Watson, Dorset CCG – Objecting to the recommendation to refuse

We are writing to strongly urge support for Dorset County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust's planning application that will kick-start a multi-million investment in our local NHS.

Multi-million pound investment in our local hospital

Every journey starts with its first step. This application is a vital first step in bringing to reality a once-in-lifetime opportunity to invest £62.5 million in our local hospital.

In summary:

- The plans will significantly expand the hospital's Emergency Department (ED) and Intensive Care Unit (ICU) and create an Integrated Care Hub on the Dorset County Hospital site in Dorchester - improving healthcare services for our population;
- The Emergency Department (ED) and Intensive Care Unit (ICU) have been a key part of the COVID-19 response, being temporarily expanded during the pandemic.
- This is a vital investment to secure the future of the hospital for a generation to come and support our hardworking NHS staff with the very best facilities and additional space to serve our community;
- This is part of a long-term project to deliver the recommendations of Dorset's clinically-led plans under the Clinical Services Review, to ensure continued and sustainable services for the west of the county;
- To enable this investment to take place and for this essential development to take place, a new multi-storey car park is required to free up space for the construction, make up for lost spaces, and improve parking for visitors, staff and patients;
- The hospital is committed to green travel and at the same time ensuring that people can access the hospital;
- If planning consent is not granted then this important project to invest in our local hospital and NHS will be delayed.

Approval for this application will be a significant milestone and is the first step in plans to deliver millions of investment into Dorset's NHS which will greatly improve local services for generations to come.

Cllr Stella Jones – Objecting to the recommendation to refuse

I strongly support the application for Dorset County Hospital , my reasons as follow

1. The officer's report states that there is no objection to the land use
The equality is adequate
Sustainable transport is acceptable
Economic impact is beneficial
Nature is a net gain
Highway concerns could be conditioned
Climate and amenity concerns could be mitigated
All good
2. However the main objection is because of an inadequate impact on the landscape
3. The impact on the local conservation area. The hospital is not in the conservation area, and as the report says the development would not directly impact on any listed building.
4. The grade 2 listed West station nearby has a very ugly industrial building next to it -The Range
5. Other conservation areas nearby have large buildings in them – Brewery Square impacts the Monmouth Road area {just stand at the top of Alfred Road and look at the flats) Bitter End flats overlooks Prince of Wales conservation area
6. Places like the Borough Gardens, Maumbury Rings, and St.Mary's Church would hardly be impacted
7. As it says in the report 'not all changes to the setting of a conservation area are harmful'
8. The report says the development would "be an incongruous element in the skyline "with long range views from Poundbury Hill Fort . Maiden Castle , Came Down , Bincombe Down ,and the Slyers Lane area .
The biggest blot on the landscape is Queen Mother Square in Poundbury, seen from all these areas . That was allowed with no problem and has less benefit to the town than the hospital development .
9. The lives of many people living in the streets around the hospital have been blighted for years by hospital parking in front of their properties , this car park would improve this.

Having spent over 40 years as a member of West Dorset District Council planning committee I have dealt with many controversial applications such as this

When the first phase of the hospital was built in the 1980s it was very contentious because of the red and blue colours on a modern design .The second phase in the 1990s even more so because of the size .

Both were built within this same conservation area . Both are now accepted as an important part of Dorchester.

The future of Dorset County Hospital is vital to the whole area .

Please support this application

Naomi Patterson - Objecting to the recommendation to refuse

Hello , I'm writing to you as a mother, campaigner, neighbour of DCH hospital & a DCH West Dorset Public Governor.

My name is Naomi and I campaigned for over 4 years for the kingfisher Ward , maternity ward & SCBU , many people from Weymouth, Portland , Bridport , Dorchester and surrounding areas supported this campaign. During this campaign it was recognised by Dorset Council & The CCG that for the safety of local residents services was to stay in the west of the county . If those services went we would've seen a downgrade to our A&E I believe this would've cost lives .

I am very saddened to see you are thinking of stopping the plans for a multi-story car park as this will then have a knock on effect towards our Vital A&E as we could end up losing the funding for the extension altogether . If this happens it will undermine all the work that many locals fought for over the years and I fear you will be putting many locals at risk.

I see some are calling for A&E & ICU to be built first . I think if they did the hospital expansion first they would build this onto the existing car parking space, and hence lose spaces, hence by building the multi story first they don't lose any spaces when they do the main build. Plus the car park is relatively simple to design and build and is ready to go, designing the main hospital extension is much more complicated and there is a long way to go on that so its not ready. Plus the spaces are needed now. I live on Wessex road and every day I see cars either parking illegally just to get to their appointment, I even know people who

have missed appointments due to car parking , I have many emails from frustrated residents & staff due to car parking , I am asking you to reconsider rejecting these plans for the safety of local residents so the plans can be built.

This building work will already take up to 5 years to build and further delays will take even longer , the expansion of the services is needed ASAP as the A&E was built for 20,000 people and we already see twice that amount using A&E .

**Chris Loder MP - Objecting to the recommendation to refuse
(Statement attached)**

Jennifer Huelin – Supporting the recommendation to refuse

The construction of the proposed multi-storey car park in a residential area is unthinkable and unacceptable. The devastating impact it will have on the local area and the lives of the families that live opposite the south end of the car park must be recognised by the planning committee.

The proposed site is within metres of a Conservation zone that includes both heritage assets and beautiful Edwardian residential homes. The sheer scale – and especially the height - of this enormous structure will create an oppressive and overbearing visual impact totally out of keeping with the local area. A 'green wall' is simply not enough to disguise a car park of this magnitude. There is a promise to retain the trees along the south wall of the car park to act as a screen - but the structure would be considerably higher than even the tallest trees and they would not provide any cover at all for much of the year.

It would be devastating to lose the character of our beautiful, historic and partially wooded area that is currently a delight to live in. The abundant wildlife in the area - including owls and hedgehogs - would also suffer from the continuous noise and pollution.

The plans do not take into consideration the environmental and physical effects they will have on the local area and lives of residents in close proximity. The multi-storey car park currently proposed would destroy the character of our local area and overwhelm the homes of families just over the road.

The hospital has a great deal of land that could be used for car-parking or as the site for an additional multi-storey car park. Staff and visitor parking could be divided between sites.

The council needs to explore other parking options that would not have such a huge impact on the unique historical assets and beautiful character of the area.

I fully support our NHS and recognise the need for more parking at our hospital. However, the proposed multi-storey car park is not an acceptable solution given the proximity of the site to heritage buildings, homes and woodland. The negative impact on the landscape, local area, environment and well-being of wildlife and residents' lives is too great.

Simon Huelin – Supporting the recommendation to refuse

I can't believe Dorchester council is considering this proposed monstrosity of a car park in the middle of a residential part of this beautiful and historic county town.

Supposedly local residents will benefit from the car park as it will stop hospital workers from taking our roadside parking spaces, this is just not the case, the roads directly surrounding the hospital and in fact the majority of Victoria park have a residents parking permit scheme that doesn't allow for this anyway.

Damer's road is already a very busy and congested road particularly at peak times and this car parking suggestion will only worsen the situation creating knock on traffic issues heading further back into the town both on the Great western road/ Cornwall road junction and also on the Williams Avenue/ Bridport road junction.

Surely the solution would be to offer a regular, efficient and reliable public transport service that would bring the predicted 'vast' amount of new workers and visitors from an out of town car park to and from the hospital and to keep the existing parking spaces for essential workers and emergency staff only? I really think that the team that had come up with this ridiculous idea really doesn't know or understand Dorchester at all.

I have lived here for 45 years and have watched the town grow, evolve and flourish whilst still maintaining its historic and beautiful character which is fitting of the county town of Dorset. In all those years I never would have imagined that this would be the sort of town to consider such a building. I know there isn't a taller building in Dorchester therefore making this car park the most prominent and dominating landmark in this

little market town, moreover I never would have imagined it would be the view from my front room window just a few metres away.

I would never have considered buying this house had the car park already been there or planned to be there and to be honest I can't think of many people who would. Not only would the visual aspects be off putting but the noise and more importantly the pollution and health aspects.

Surely as a responsible council you should be encouraging cycle to work schemes, park and ride schemes, decongestion, cutting pollution, reducing traffic, planting not cutting down and most importantly keeping the County town the beautiful and unspoilt home to many that it has always been?

Philip Jordan – Supporting the recommendation to refuse

As patient, parent &/or relation/patient friend/DCH Trust member (+ retired NHS Estates professional)

can I congratulate DCH/staff on their “good” (24/7/365 ED/ICU etc/Planned) Healthcare record:

- led by a Chief Executive who inspires commitment/loyalty:
- vital to DCHFT's 21 Aug 20 email to Trust membership saying about continuing

“to deliver high quality care to everyone who needs DCH now & in the future” &

Even more vital post Recommendation to refuse WD/D/19/002627 MSCP etc /Masterplan Planning Permission

- + Application Documents/related “communications” inexactitudes
- + (though mandatory from 1990s) DCH's apparent Estates Strategy lack
- + Cumulative impact +significant issues the Application didn't mention/properly consider e.g.
- Accessibility
- Climate

All lead me to suggest:

- as NPPF 2.7 (echoing Dr Brundtland to 1987's UN General Assembly - including Thatcher):

“The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.” & “the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs

- **addressing patient (short-)long term (range/depth/scope etc) need, MSCP etc /Masterplan Application failure/s**

(**& CCG's “not fit for purpose” CSR/related STP**) **via thorough grounded Sustainable DCH Estates Strategy aligned with accurate/widely based Patient Need Review + thorough Survey/Analysis of (keep all under Review) existing**

DCH Buildings/ adjacent spaces etc i.e. all DCH @ Williams Ave between existing boundaries apropos:

use/capacity/structure & services/condition/climate/access*/R&M etc + particular attention to include e.g.

- EW vehicular onsite accessibility maintenance/enhancement +

- Not extending Existing Buildings & thus blocking EW access

- How/what to do to replace Phase 1 +

- Access to all existing DCH (inc Damers) Bldgs +

- temp Trust HQ/Support Centre use of main Damers Bldg +

- potential in **“Future of Mobility...”**, March 2019, HMG + UN SDGs/Nov 19 Emissions Gap Report e.g.

- **What's DCH potential re “Future of Mobility ” &/or Renewable Energy?**

Concurrent with urgently developing/implementing:

A) DCH 7 storey MSCP under former Playing Field (ideally future proofed with adjustable levels) & @ old School Building ground floor level install:

B) Passivhaus/ZedPOD type (re-useable) “shell” including (temporay) new ED/ICU & then

C) Existing ED convert to Primary Care Hub + assuming DCHFT HQ temp relocation

D) Further 7 storey MSCP under now vacant HQ etc (also ideally with adjustable levels) & ready on completion for e.g. Phase 1 temp relocation/Residential use & remember - post 10yrs+(25% of working

life) Austerity's impact on expertise/careers: this HMG's recent Infrastructure funding that DCH's attracting/needs, must mean (even without Covid/Climate Change/Brexit complications) likely material/cost inflation & restricted availability of relevant, experienced professional expertise – to replace those who produced the Application Recommended for refusal.

Cllr Robin Potter, Dorchester Town Council – Objecting to the recommendation to refuse

In addition to our submissions as shown in the officer's report, which we still hold to, by the way, I should like to make the following additional comments:

The Town Council recognises the great work that Dorset County Hospital is doing and is supportive of the extension works as part of the priority project in the National Health Infrastructure plan.

We consider that the multi-storey car park in this application will be necessary to facilitate the proper working of the hospital and for patients and visitors to access the buildings.

The positioning of the car park at the lowest point of the site will reduce the visual impact in views from further away, so that this is little or no worse than those of the existing Thomas Hardy Sports hall, the buildings of Brewery Square and of Poundbury. Ensuring that the existing mature trees are retained will mitigate the impact on the immediate street scene.

We would request that measures are conditioned to minimise these impacts and that the car park is made as attractive as possible from nearby, utilising measures such as those shown to the council's Planning & Environment committee with appropriate colouring and designs on the East and South faces.

Patricia Miller, Chief Executive, Dorset County Hospital, Applicant - Objecting to the recommendation to refuse

Dorset County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust is committed to providing outstanding care to our patients. In order to do so, and as part of the Dorset Clinical Services Review, the hospital has to change. There are a number of issues which, if not resolved now, will severely hamper the healthcare services provided to the residents of West Dorset in the future.

We have to expand our Emergency Department and Intensive Care Unit, which are inadequately sized for the current population, and establish an Integrated Care Hub. The hospital has been allocated £62.5million of Government Health Infrastructure Plan funding for the development of these clinical facilities as a national priority project.

We have developed a masterplan that centres on the social value of the hospital in Dorchester as an anchor institution. Staff recruitment and retention is crucial to maintaining high quality services and providing key worker housing is an important aspect of this.

We also need to help local people stay in their homes as long as possible by building homes in which 'extra care' can be delivered and a step-down care home to get patients out of a clinical environment and back home when they are ready.

However, all of this is not possible without freeing up space at the hospital currently used to park cars. We cannot simply lose the parking spaces - I'm sure you are all aware of the parking issues at the hospital. We promote green travel and will do more through a new green travel plan, but we have to recognise that for many patients and staff living in rural locations there is no alternative to travelling by car.

We understand the site constraints and the value of the Dorchester Conservation Area. We have worked with a team of specialists to ensure that what we are proposing is appropriate to the area and have tried to work with the Council planners to reach a position which is agreeable to all. We have sought to provide a car park building that is attractive and appropriate to the local area through the landscape artwork.

We are working closely with our contractors to make sure local people are employed and local suppliers used for our building projects to support the local economy. We have estimated a social value return in excess of £4m from the parking project alone.

Chair and Committee, as you can see, this planning application is not just about a car park. It is the future of Dorset County Hospital. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to improve the health services for the communities of Dorset, to ensure that we are still able to provide outstanding care for many years to come.

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

Cllr John Worth – Objecting to the recommendation to refuse

Dorset hospital serves a large rural area and as such is not easily accessible by public transport, parking has been an ongoing issue as there is limited on site parking, which puts pressure on the local road network with patients and visitors forced to use on street parking in the area. If the facility's for the hospital are to be improved and update to serve the ever growing population. Development has to start with improved car parking and a new multi story car park, will free up land currently used for parking, to allow further development of the hospital site to meet current and future needs of this area of Dorset.

Whilst I appreciate the concerns of the planning officer I feel that the majority of the residents of Dorset would support this application in order to have a local hospital fit for purpose.

I appreciate the opportunity to write to the members of the Northern area planning committee and sincerely hope that they will see the merits of this application and move to approve it.

Ben Print, Clinicians, DCH - Objecting to the recommendation to refuse

Our Emergency Department and Intensive Care Units have been under extreme pressure for most of 2020, but our teams responded incredibly well to the COVID-19 pandemic considering the constraints we have been working under.

We did not start from a comfortable position as we have been dealing with rising attendances and space constraints for many years. Normally, we see the number of patients increase in the winter and fall again in the spring. COVID hit us following what was already a peak in winter patient numbers. The number of patients attending ED did not fall during the summers of 2018 or 2019 and they continued to rise.

In 2018/19 the department saw a 7.2% increase on the previous year and in 2019/20 this increased by a further 2.8%. The department is now operating well in excess of double the number of attendees it was originally designed for. This is set to only increase further due to the reconfiguration of services in Poole and Bournemouth, which recently received planning permission for clinical expansion, including a new car park.

In spite of the pressures on the department, our ED continues to be one of the best performing in the country thanks to the efforts of our outstanding teams. The redevelopment of our clinical facilities has been recognised by the Government as a nationally important project with the

allocation of £62.5m for expansion from the Health Infrastructure Plan (HIP).

Responding to COVID has seen changes to the ED already. We had to start working out of temporary buildings for triaging patients - not the best environment for our patients or staff. Due to social distancing requirements, the number of temporary buildings is likely to have to increase as services are restarted. The only place that we can see these buildings located is on areas already used for car parking. This will further increase the parking pressures at DCH.

What the past two years has shown is that the ED cannot continue to operate effectively and safely without significant investment in the buildings that it operates within. The Government has recognised this through its Health Infrastructure Plan - however to make the space available, the parking situation at DCH must be improved. We fully support the planning application for the new multi-storey car park as this will allow the space for a new ED and

ICU to be built for the benefit of the Dorset population. Local people also back these plans - an online register of support that we launched had attracted over 2,400 responses from local residents at the time of writing this statement.

We ask that you support the planning application so that the much needed clinical improvements can be delivered.

Walter and Jane Brewster – Supporting the recommendation to refuse

My wife and I live opposite the location of the planned multi-storey car park and whilst we wholeheartedly support the need for new medical facilities within the hospital site we feel that the car park is the wrong solution to providing access for a number of reasons.

Visual – We feel that the proposed 7 storey building, above ground and in its planned location will be completely out of character with the surrounding residential housing. It will have a detrimental impact on the visual aesthetic in this area. The sheer size of the construction will impact permanently on this historically important part of Dorchester which features a number of older buildings retained within the hospital grounds.

Environmental – The well documented effect on the mature trees and wildlife will be significant. We understand that hedgehogs may be

particularly affected. Their numbers are already known to be reducing due to increased traffic through many of Dorset's villages. Pollution from existing diesel and petrol cars will continue to blight the lives of local residents until better technologies are in the ascendant. I doubt that anyone can identify any beautiful multi-storey car parks. They are usually structures communities are aiming to avoid and removal in many town centres has proved to be overdue and costly.

Damage to local properties– Residents in the nearest houses in Damers Rd are particularly concerned about damage to their properties during construction. Pile-driving may cause significant issues to many and we doubt this can be attenuated.

Lack of vision – We feel that this mid-20th century solution to a 21st century problem is seriously lacking in vision. Conventional vehicles are being discouraged and banned in other forward-looking towns and cities whilst this development seeks to ignore the issue and happily welcomes more cars into an already congested area. A construction such as this with the effect on its locality should have formed part of a whole town plan. If it had to be done it should have been situated underground as is done in many towns on the continent. We strongly suggest that this is lazy, conventional thinking based on requiring a short-term fix when society is moving quickly towards very different solutions. Our preference would be for a much fuller commitment to Park and Ride schemes and the links that could be put in place to bring all stakeholders to the hospital site. Done properly this will not only eliminate the need for more space, it would also remove the need for almost all present parking on the site.

Item 5b - West of Shaftesbury Road at Land South of Gillingham, Shaftesbury Road. Gillingham

No statements received



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

As the Member of Parliament, not just for Dorchester, but for the wider community across West Dorset, I cannot emphasise enough the importance of this proposed development. I, therefore, urge the Planning Committee to approve this planning application in order to enable the NHS to continue taking care of the many thousands of people in rural Dorset. Dorset County Hospital is not only used by my 100,000 constituents, but also those from further afield.

I understand that the officers are recommending this planning application for refusal. In the middle of a global pandemic, having just experienced the worst national health crisis in living memory, the local NHS needs our support more than ever.

It has been incredibly difficult for my me and my colleagues to finally secure major Government investment into West Dorset. If this project is refused, the Council will, in effect, be pushing £62.5 million out of the county. As a former West Dorset District Councillor, myself, I find it difficult to reconcile that the Council could consider doing this.

As this application has been deferred on several occasions, there is an increasingly urgent need for development to begin. The Accident & Emergency Department at Dorset County Hospital was originally built for 22,000 attendances per year and is now seeing close to 50,000. There is an urgent need for expanded capacity.

Rural Dorset, like the whole country, is going through a period of recession. Aside from the healthcare benefits, the proposed construction will be a source of much needed employment for many in and around West Dorset, helping to stimulate the local economy.

We are fortunate to live in a democracy where democratically elected councillors have the final say on applications such as this. There have been, there are, and there will be residents in your wards whose lives depend on Dorset County Hospital; and Dorset County Hospital ultimately will depend on the works outlined within this application to meet the future needs of your residents. I cannot urge councillors enough to support this planning application from the Hospital.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Chris Loder".

Chris Loder MP

Member of Parliament for West Dorset

cc: Richard Drax MP, South Dorset
Simon Hoare MP, North Dorset
Michael Tomlinson MP, Mid Dorset and North Poole

This page is intentionally left blank



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

Mr Matt Prosser
CEO, Dorset Council
South Walks House
South Walks Road
Dorchester DT1 1UZ

14 September, 2020

Dear Matt

DCH development

I should be most grateful if this letter were copied and handed to each member of the Planning Committee that intends to listen to this application on the 15th.

I attach to it a submission from my neighbour, and the hospital's MP, Chris Loder. It is an excellent letter and I concur with it.

We are both keen that our submissions are read out at the planning meeting as we cannot contribute any other way, we've been told. While I do not wish to dwell on that point, I would be grateful if our views are known by Members, who will be recommended to refuse the application.

As you know, Chris and I have done all we could to help the hospital get approval for its application on the grounds the car park is key to the rest of the development, which is attracting Government funds to the tune of over £60 million.

It would seem perverse if this application was turned down over a bureaucratic matter that surely can be overcome. In addition, timing is important, as Chris says, and we do not want to lose these monies.

My warm regards.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Richard Drax', written over a horizontal line.

CHRIS LODER MP



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

As the Member of Parliament, not just for Dorchester, but for the wider community across West Dorset, I cannot emphasise enough the importance of this proposed development. I, therefore, urge the Planning Committee to approve this planning application in order to enable the NHS to continue taking care of the many thousands of people in rural Dorset. Dorset County Hospital is not only used by my 100,000 constituents, but also those from further afield.

I understand that the officers are recommending this planning application for refusal. In the middle of a global pandemic, having just experienced the worst national health crisis in living memory, the local NHS needs our support more than ever.

It has been incredibly difficult for my me and my colleagues to finally secure major Government investment into West Dorset. If this project is refused, the Council will, in effect, be pushing £62.5 million out of the county. As a former West Dorset District Councillor, myself, I find it difficult to reconcile that the Council could consider doing this.

As this application has been deferred on several occasions, there is an increasingly urgent need for development to begin. The Accident & Emergency Department at Dorset County Hospital was originally built for 22,000 attendances per year and is now seeing close to 50,000. There is an urgent need for expanded capacity.

Rural Dorset, like the whole country, is going through a period of recession. Aside from the healthcare benefits, the proposed construction will be a source of much needed employment for many in and around West Dorset, helping to stimulate the local economy.

We are fortunate to live in a democracy where democratically elected councillors have the final say on applications such as this. There have been, there are, and there will be residents in your wards whose lives depend on Dorset County Hospital; and Dorset County Hospital ultimately will depend on the works outlined within this application to meet the future needs of your residents. I cannot urge councillors enough to support this planning application from the Hospital.

Chris Loder

Chris Loder MP

Member of Parliament for West Dorset

cc: Richard Drax MP, South Dorset
Simon Hoare MP, North Dorset
Michael Tomlinson MP, Mid Dorset and North Poole

Member of Parliament for West Dorset

Page 26

chris.loder.mp@parliament.uk www.chrisloder.co.uk

Email from Simon Hoare MP re DCH car Park

Dear Ms King

While not in my constituency many of my constituents use DCH. A perennial problem is the lack of car parking. As rural public transport provision declines use of the car is often the only way to get to and from an appointment in a day particularly if the appointment is very early or late in the day.

The application to increase parking is to be welcomed and I would urge the Committee to support the proposal. I note an officer's view being based "on balance " it should be refused. That is clearly a subjective judgement call rather than a fixed, immutable policy reference.

Securing health investment in Dorset is not without its challenges. Having secured this funding let us not shoot the gift horse. Let's approve this application!

Yours

Simon Hoare

Simon Hoare MP for North Dorset
House of Commons
London
SW1 A 0AA

This page is intentionally left blank

Written Submissions
Tuesday 15 September 2020

Item 5c - Land at E 373794 - 117227, Thornhill Road, Stalbridge

Mr & Mrs Wiles - OBJECT

The previous layout was asked to be changed by the Planning & Urban Design Officer at Dorset Council because of the '**poor outlook**' for residents of Bibberne Row.

Now the same row of terraced houses that were in the middle of Bibberne Row have been moved further up and down and now are in front of bungalows, numbers 1 and 5. This means we will have no outlook at all compared with all the other bungalows as this house is only at the minimum distance away of 20 meters from our bungalow and the view from our lounge will be directly into the gable end of the two storey house and at only 12 meters from our garden to our garden. This house, parking spaces and garden run along the whole frontage of our bungalow just a few meters from our bedroom windows, also the noise from the cars and therefore will be overbearing and impact on our privacy and visual amenity.

TURLEYS SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT 03/09/2020 - STATES

1.17 • Respecting the site's neighbouring properties with development set back to maintain privacy of existing homes;

Why is now deemed acceptable to have the same row of houses moved away from the two middle bungalows to give them an outlook but not ourselves.

There is only one other existing bungalow that looks into a side elevation and that bungalow is now between 24 and 28 meters away after the owners complained.

Our Ward Councillor Graham Carr-Jones objected saying,

"Notwithstanding the required 20 distance has now been met, at that distance it continues to eliminate privacy to the bungalow garden boundary belonging to Mr & Mrs Wiles."

Mr Lennis sent us an email saying, "Sovereign, is not prepared to change their proposal any further with regard to your property."

All they have done is to hip the roof on the house which makes no difference to the height.

Sovereign had to change the distance to 20 meters of the two storey house in front of us because they broke the condition of the outline planning permission.

The orientation of the house had to be changed as it was stated by Sovereigns agent Turleys.

3.9

The housing fronts onto the roads running through the site, with the detached and semidetached houses towards the western and southern parts of the site, and terraces towards the eastern end.

The obvious answer would be to have bungalows on plots 16 & 17 kept at least the same distance away. There is a know need for bungalows and would be more in keeping with existing properties bordering the development site.

Mrs Edith Wiles – OBJECT

I am disappointed that plot 16 has not been moved as this row of three, two storey terraced houses and car parking spaces are very close to my boundary and the windows from all three houses which are facing east will overlook my bungalow and garden which will create extra noise, light and pollution.

I spend a lot of time in my garden and feel my privacy will be compromised by being over looked by these houses.

The last layout was turned down because of the poor outlook for some bungalows in Bibberne Row so now they have moved those houses in front of number 1 and numbers 4/5.

Number 2 and 3 Bibberne Row are set back further than the other bungalows in Bibberne Row and they are the ones who have a very good outlook, a large green space, a road and then parking spaces before there are any houses which seems very unfair to the other residents.

Bibberne Row has five bungalows and three of them would be severely affected if these two storey houses are built so close to the boundary.

There are several trees planted along my boundary that should be planted well away as not to overhang onto my drive.

As a resident of Bibberne Row, i stand to unfairly lose out significantly financially if the development is not sympathetic to surrounding properties.

Mr and Mrs Wooster – OBJECT

We write to object to the proximity of plots 16&17 on the proposed plan.

The proposal states that the properties in Bibberne Row would face onto open spaces on the development! Not true! we at No1 would face onto the blank wall of plot 17 along with 10 parking spaces affording us poor air quality, pollution and noise. Whilst we do not claim the right to a view, we do claim the right to privacy and a non-overbearing outlook. This will only be proven once the properties are built. A suggestion that bungalows could replace the houses on plots 16&17 would go a long way to easing the situation.

We note that a gatehouse is to be built at the development entrance giving the site a “unique character” to passing traffic whilst we in a Band F property have to look at the unattractive side of the development. Sofie Smith did raise the point of poor outlooks early on in the development of these plans. Whilst on the subject of plots 16&17 it has been stated that these were reserved for part ownership. This must be adhered too in future occupation allocation.

The original Grant of Outline Consent dated 1st March 2019 Item 21 states dry layered course stone walls to mark boundaries. The proposed red brick with timber infill does not seem to adhere to the consent. We are also concerned that the risk of flood has not been properly addressed. The on-site tests were carried out during a period of very little rain and obviously provided acceptable results. We suggest as recommended by FRM team that tests are carried out during a wet winter period.

Annette Cattle – Sovereign Homes - SUPPORT

Sovereign Housing Association is driven by its social purpose to deliver quality affordable homes to meet the growing demands in the region. We recognise that poor housing conditions can impact the long term health, prospects and potential of those living in them and put pressure on the services supporting them. Sovereign is committed to developing modern, fuel efficient homes built to good space standards where people will be happy to live.

We work closely with the Housing Enabling team at Dorset Council to ensure a continuing supply of much needed affordable rent and shared ownership homes throughout the County. The Association supports the Council's Homebuilding Programme for 20,000 additional homes by 2033.

Dorset is one of the most expensive places in the UK to rent or buy a home, forcing many people to leave areas that they can no longer afford to live in. Thornhill Road will provide 60 new affordable homes for rent and low cost home ownership to those on the Council's housing register. The Association is a not for profit organisation and the development will receive grant funding from Homes England as part of the Strategic Partnership Programme.

Support for this site was received from Paul Derrien, Housing Enabling Team Leader, as part of our pre-acquisition scrutiny process. At that time, September 2018, there were 949 potential applicants on the housing register for this type of housing - this demonstrates the extent of need in the area.

These 60 properties at Thornhill Road will provide local families with secure affordable homes, creating a balanced and sustainable community – making it a great place to live.

Aaron Wright – Turley & Co, Agent – SUPPORT

As Members are aware, outline consent was granted in March 2019 for up to 60 no. dwellings, open space and vehicular access from Thornhill Road.

In November 2019 a Design Code was submitted to Dorset Council setting out the design parameters for the site. This was approved in December 2019, with the full support of your Urban Designer. My client has listened to the comments of neighbouring properties and met with them on-site. Extensive changes have been made, as follows:

- Reorientation and redesign of Plot 21 to further minimise any impact on the neighbouring property Kingsmead. The separation distance between Kingsmead and Plot 21 is 24 – 28m.
- Plots 16 & 17, closest to Bibbene Row have been reoriented so the front elevation fronts onto the new public open space. There are no first floor windows facing towards Bibberne Row. The plots have been repositioned over 20m away from these residents.
- Residents in Bibberne Row requested a hard boundary treatment between themselves and the application site. A new a 1.8m brick wall with close board timber in-fill panels is now proposed to provide a permanent solid separation.
- The two storey block of apartments have been repositioned away from the boundary with the neighbouring property Greenfields, and replaced with rear gardens.

The scheme is recommended for approval by the Case Officer and has the full support of your Urban Designer. There is no loss of privacy or amenity to local residents.

The scheme incorporates high quality open space that is accessible to new residents and a footpath link will be incorporated into the scheme to promote connectivity. The proposed landscaping scheme will enhance biodiversity through native planting, enhancement of hedgerows and new tree planting.

Sovereign Homes approach to development is inherently sustainable, with their aim to deliver quality affordable homes which meets the needs and aspirations of everyone. A Sustainability Statement has been submitted to demonstrate our commitment to sustainability.

The outline consent was subject to 3 pre-commencement conditions relating to surface water and foul drainage. My client will work collaboratively with the Drainage Engineer and Council, before formally submitting a Discharge of Condition application. This reserved matters application is purely seeking approval for the siting, layout, appearance and landscaping of the site. All other matters will be dealt with through the planning conditions attached to the outline consent. 2

This scheme provides much need affordable homes to local people, and has been designed to ensure that it sits well within the landscaping without impacting on residential amenity. I would like to thank officers for their assistance in dealing with the application, and for recommending approval for the scheme.

Statement received but not to be read out

Mr & Mrs Hutchison – OBJECT

We wish to object to the latest layout presented for land off Thornhill Road.

Moving plots 14,15,16 away from Bibberne Row results in a more "solid" block of buildings in view of the back of Ham Cottage and our only garden area.

6 dwellings and their gardens (10% of the development) abut our boundary or directly overlook our home. They will reduce our privacy, sunlight, increase noise and light pollution, reduce the tranquility of the

rural space at the back of our house and have an adverse impact on the enjoyment of existing neighbouring properties.

The moving of plots 12 + 13 results in an alteration in the symmetry formed with plots 40 + 41 about which Sovereign made a positive point previously.

The latest plans with the 2 terraces in a row (42-49) spoil the overall layout design: whilst the original designs gave an impression of a light and fairly attractive layout, the final proposed layout is dense in places and unbalanced.

Whilst there are comprehensive plans regarding trees/plants/potential for wildlife habitats, we consider there is insufficient detail of how these areas are going to be maintained, especially the 2 metre landscape buffer, given that the cramped design means that the roads and pavements cannot be adopted.

We do not consider there is sufficient variety in materials proposed to ensure that " housing within the scheme has been inspired by the local context of Stalbridge".

We assume that the reference to "vitality of Overton" (Sustainability Statement September 2020 :1.5) is an oversight.

Item 5d - Land North of, Burton Street, Marnhull, Dorset

Mark King – OBJECT

Our family live next to the proposed entrance to the development, living there we are very aware of how dangerous this piece of road already is, it is a completely blind bend that causes cars to be thrown across to the opposite lane traveling one way and for drivers to cut the corner traveling in the opposite direction, adding access from this bend will only increase the risk of accident.

This section of road is also a very busy thoroughfare with no pathway and can be quite dangerous for pedestrians especially in poor weather conditions, again add in another entrance/ exit and it becomes more dangerous to people who have no choice in using this stretch of road.

I would also like to raise a major issue of noise and privacy, which would be greatly impacted by this development. Not only would our garden be overlooked by houses, creating more noise and light pollution, but with a constant flow of people and traffic passing our garden as the main point of access we would no longer be able to sit in privacy and relax in our garden, this would have a adverse effect on my already poor mental health which is a key reason to why we moved to the property originally, the privacy and piece.

I would also like to raise the issue of flooding, our garden already experiences some flooding with runoff from the fields when we have persistent rain, this can only be made worse when water has a direct root via paths and roads and nothing to soak up a proportion of the water. This also applies to the road which runs like a river and causes major issues of aquaplaning for cars.

Also, the access is completely blind due to high banks on either side forcing you to pull into the road to see.

I hope these issues can be raised and taken into consideration at the forthcoming meeting.

Steve Clark, Savills (Agent) – SUPPORT

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

The application before you was previously considered by the Planning Committee of (the former) North Dorset District Council on the 26th March 2019. The Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 agreement.

The only reason that the application is now before the Dorset Council Northern Area Planning Committee is because since the previous resolution, the Council's Officers no longer consider that the NHS contribution requested meets the necessary policy and legal tests. Furthermore, the NHS Trust has also withdrawn their request for this contribution. The Section 106 agreement has now been prepared without the NHS contribution, agreed and completed by the applicant and Council Officers.

As set out in paragraph 3.3.2 of the Committee report, the Council continues to be unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and there have been no other significant policy changes since the previous Planning Committee's decision in March 2019. The application benefits from no objections from any statutory consultees. It is therefore considered that the application continues to represent sustainable development with no impacts that significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of housing delivery.

The applicant would also like to confirm to the Planning Committee their agreement to the additional condition suggested in the Committee report for the provision of electric vehicle charging points on site in response to the Council's climate emergency declaration.

The Committee report addresses the single reason that this application is brought before the Planning Committee again and explains that there have not been any significant policy changes since the Planning Committee made its previous decision on the 26th March 2019. We therefore hope that you will endorse your officer's professional recommendation to enable the prompt delivery of new homes that would make an important contribution towards housing delivery and addressing the lack of 5 year supply in the Local Plan area.

APPLICATION NUMBER: WD/D/19/002627

APPLICATION SITE: Dorset County Hospital, Williams Avenue, Dorchester

PROPOSAL: Erection of multi storey car park & improvements to internal site roads & temporary change of use of former school field to car parking

Decision

1. To grant planning permission on the grounds that the social and economic benefits in respect of parking and funding for the hospital outweighed the harm to the landscape and visual impact. Members were satisfied that the harm to heritage significance was considerably outweighed by public benefit.
2. That the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman, agree the conditions.
3. That an advisory note be added regarding community involvement in the design and artwork of the exterior of the building.
4. That an informative be added regarding the flood risk management team.
5. That a note be added to the biodiversity mitigating enhancement plan regarding trees.

Conditions:

To be agreed with the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman.

APPLICATION NUMBER: 2/2020/0379/FUL

APPLICATION SITE: West of Shaftesbury Road at Land South of Gillingham, Shaftesbury Road, Gillingham, Dorset

PROPOSAL: Construction of a principal street, associated access, landscaping and infrastructure works

Decision: Approved, subject to no adverse comment from the Environment Agency and the conditions.

CONDITIONS:

Time Limits

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).

Approved Plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location Plan/Red Line Plan, Ref – HI1177/50/2/A

Engineering General Layout Plan, Ref - HI1177/54/1/Orig

Road 1 – Cross Sections (Sheet 1 of 4), Ref – HI1177/56/01/Orig

Road 1 – Cross Sections (Sheet 2 of 4), Ref – HI1177/56/02/Orig

Road 1 – Cross Sections (Sheet 3 of 4), Ref – HI1177/56/03/Orig

Road 1 – Cross Sections (Sheet 4 of 4), Ref - HI1177/56/04/Orig

Road 1 – Vertical Alignment Longitudinal Section (Sheet 1 of 2), Ref – HI1177/55/01/Orig

Road 1 – Vertical Alignment Longitudinal Section (Sheet 2 of 2), Ref – HI1177/55/02/Orig

Street Lighting Proposals, Ref - HI1177/53/1/B

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

Construction

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) dated 10 June 2020.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of neighbouring residents and the interest of highway safety.

Trees/Landscaping

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved Street Trees and Planting details;

Street Trees and Planting Plan, Ref – L-001-104 C, dated 13/07/20

Street Trees and Planting Plan, Ref – L-002-104 C, dated 13/07/20

Street Trees and Planting Plan, Ref – L-003-104 C, dated 13/07/20

Street Trees and Planting Plan, Ref – L-004-104 C, dated 13/07/20

Planting Plan, Planting Schedule & Details, Ref – L-001-107 D, dated 14/07/20

Gillingham Principal Street Seed schedule by areas, Rev B.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of neighbouring residents and the interest of highway safety.

5. The proposal shall be carried out in accordance with approved Arboricultural Impact Appraisal, dated 17 April 2020 and the plan entitled 'Protection measures to trees affected by the works' reference no. HI1177/20/2/Orig dated 16th April 2020.

Reason: In the interest of protecting the trees retained on site.

6. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the principal street and any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of the amenity and appearance of the location.

Flooding/Drainage

7. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision of compensatory flood storage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding.

8. Prior to commencement of the development, a detailed surface water management scheme and design for the site must be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall clarify how surface water is to be managed during construction, consider the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development (including ground water levels during a winter period), topographic & urban design constraints (including Health & Safety) and accord with the following submissions:

- Gillingham Principal Street Drainage Strategy, Rev C, dated 09/09/20.

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, to improve habitat and amenity and to ensure correct functioning of drainage for the development.

9. Prior to the commencement of development details of maintenance and management of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme shall be 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.

Heritage

10. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved 'Access Road, Gillingham SSA, Gillingham, Dorset: Written Scheme of Investigation for an archaeological excavation', Dated February 2020.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded.

Contamination

11. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from soil contamination to the future occupants of the development and neighbouring occupiers are minimised.

Ecology

12. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), dated 18 June 2020, Version 4.

Reason: To ensure that the development conserves and enhances the landscape and biodiversity.

13. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Great Crested Newt Information and Mitigation Strategy, dated July 2020.

Reason: To ensure that the development conserves and enhances the landscape and biodiversity.

14. Prior to the commencement of any development a scheme for Great Crested Newt financial compensation and the creation of offsite compensation ponds shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The payment and scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and to a timetable agreed with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development conserves and enhances the landscape and biodiversity.

Informatives

INFORMATIVE NOTE: Rights of Way

Temporary ROW closures must be completed and returned at least 13 weeks before the intended closure date. There is a fee applicable.

The self-closing pedestrian gates to be installed are to be to the current British Standard BS5709:2018)

Where N64/33 will pass through an agricultural gateway South of the proposed Road) a self-closing gate is to be added to the side to allow the landowner to lock the field gate for security purposes if required.

INFORMATIVE NOTE: Section 278

The highway works referred to in the recommended condition above must be carried out to the specification and satisfaction of the Highway Authority in consultation with the Planning Authority and it may be necessary to enter into an agreement, under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, with the Highway Authority, before any works commence on the site.

INFORMATIVES NOTE: Land Drainage Consent (LDC)

We note that a Land Drainage Consent (LDC) application has been submitted in respect of the proposed culverts. It is proposed that the final culvert designs and installation methodology will be finalised through this regulatory process, rather than planning. The proposed culverts will need to comply with the JBA technical requirements.

INFORMATIVES NOTE: Environmental Permit

An Environmental Permit may be required from the EA, as relevant regulator for all works to a designated Main River that take place in, under or over, or as prescribed under relevant byelaws in accordance with section 109 of the Water Resources Act 1991. To clarify the Environment Agency's requirements, the applicant should contact the relevant department by emailing floodriskpermit@environment-agency.gov.uk

Reasons for the Decision

- The site is allocated in the North Dorset Local Plan (Policy 21)
- The construction of the Principal Street has funding secured through Homes England (HIF). This funding is time limited with project milestones to meet and a longstop of March 2022 for the infrastructure to be completed.
- The provision of this infrastructure could potentially speed up housing delivery on the Gillingham strategic site allocation.
- 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.
- Applications within the strategic site allocation area have been approved or have resolution to approve subject to s.106/conditions. Reserved matters has been approved for 2/2014/0968/OUT for 90 dwellings and outline applications 2/2018/0036/OUT and 2/2018/0077/OUT for up to 1,595 dwellings rely upon this infrastructure and have been recommended for approval, subject to conditions/s.106.
- The development of the Gillingham strategic site allocation would secure significant economic and social benefits.
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

APPLICATION NUMBER: 2/2019/1710/REM

APPLICATION SITE: Land at E 373794 N 117227, Thornhill Road, Stalbridge, Dorset

PROPOSAL: Erect 60 No. dwellings, form public open space, local equipped area of play and attenuation pond. (Reserved Matters application to determine appearance, layout, landscaping and scale; and to discharge Condition Nos. 15 - Landscape Environment Plan, 17 - Soft Landscaping, 18 - Footpath Link, 21 - Materials Palette, 22 - Public Art and 24 - Lighting and Signage; following grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2017/1095/OUT).

Decision: Approved, subject to conditions.

CONDITIONS:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of this approval.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.

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

Site Location Plan – 8087-PL-2-01

Site Layout Plan 18087-PL-2-02 Rev F

Site Layout Plan Tenure 18087-PL-2-03 Rev E

Site Layout Plan Building Materials 18087-PL-2-05 Rev E

Site Layout Plan Boundary Materials 18087-PL-2-06 Rev G

Site Layout Plan Parking/Bins and Cycle 18087-PL-2-07 Rev E

Housetype Pack Rev 5:

- 1 BED FLAT – PLANS, 18087-PL-HT-1-01
- 1 BED FLAT – ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-1-02
- FLATS BIN ENCLOSURE - PLAN & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-1-03
- 2 BED - WITH BAY - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-2-01 rev A
- 2 BED - WITH BAY - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-2-02 rev B
- 2 BED - BRICK/RENDER - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-2-03 rev A
- 2 BED - BRICK DETAIL - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-2-04
- 2 BED - MID-TERRACE - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-2-05 rev A
- 2 BED - BRICK/RENDER - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-2-06
- 3 BED - TYPE A - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-3A-01 rev A
- 3 BED - TYPE A - DETACHED - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-3A-02 rev A
- 3 BED - TYPE A - HIPPED - PLANS&ELEVATIONS,18087-PL-HT-3A-03 rev B
- 3 BED - TYPE B - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-3B-01 rev A
- 3 BED - TYPE B - BRICK/RENDER - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-3B-02 rev A
- 3 BED - TYPE B - BRICK/RENDER EOT - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-3B-03
- 3 BED - TYPE B - BRICK/FLINT EOT - PLANS & ELEVATIONS,18087-PL-HT-3B-04
- 3 BED - TYPE C - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-3C-01
- 4 BED - TYPE A - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-4A-01 rev B
- 4 BED - TYPE B - PLANS & ELEVATIONS, 18087-PL-HT-4B-01 rev A

Materials Schedule – 18087_9_10 PL Rev D

Naturally Equipped Play Area Details – DD368C_LP03.01

Landscape Ecological Management Plan (as amended) received 29 July 2020.
Detailed Landscape Plan Sheet 1 – 4 – DD368E_LP01.01

Detailed Landscape Plan Sheet 2 – 4 – DD368E_LP01.02
Detailed Landscape Plan Sheet 3 – 4 – DD368E_LP01.03
Detailed Landscape Plan Sheet 4 – 4 – DD368E_LP01.04

Hard Landscape Plan Sheet 1 – 3 – DD368D_LP02.01
Hard Landscape Plan Sheet 2 – 3 – DD368D_LP02.02
Hard Landscape Plan Sheet 3 – 3 – DD368D_LP02.03

Surface and Foul Water Drainage – J005-PL-DS-101-C

General Arrangement Layout - J005-PL-GA-101-C

Highway Long Sections Sheet 1 – 2 J005-PL-LS-101B
Highway Long Sections Sheet 1=2 – 2 J005-PL-LS-102B

Horizontal Luminance (lux) – 14788-2-C dated 25 March 2020, (plan of street lighting layout);

forming the approved application.

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

3. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, no streetlighting (i.e. luminance) shall be used from a pole greater than two meters in height between the hours of 00:00 and 06:00.

Reason: in the interest of ecology and character of the area.

4. 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 window or other openings shall be created at first floor level or above on units 16 and 17 on the flank (north-west) elevation without the prior grant of planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interest of neighbour amenity.

5. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, details or samples of external brick, flint, stone, and tile to be used in the construct of dwellings hereby approved shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to ensure proper planning and that the development takes the opportunity for improving the character and quality of the area.

6. Prior to first occupation of any dwelling on site, and notwithstanding the details approved drawing number 18087-PL-HT-1-02, details of design and materials for window cills, arches, and lintel shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to ensure proper planning and that the development takes the opportunity for improving the character and quality of the area.

Reasons for the Decision

- The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping.
- The layout and design would not result in any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application. In particular, the loss or change in a view cannot be given weight in terms of amenity.

- Details of surface water management must be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development.
- Delivery of housing following the grant of outline planning permission in the absence of 5 year land supply

APPLICATION NUMBER: [2/2018/1808/OUT](#)

APPLICATION SITE: Land North Of, Burton Street, Marnhull, Dorset,

PROPOSAL: Develop land by the erection of up to 61 No. dwellings, form vehicular and pedestrian access, public open space and attenuation basins. (Outline application to determine access).

Decision: Approved, subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement, without NHS contributions. That Marnhull Parish Council be supported in their endeavours to obtain a 20mph speed limit. That an informative be added regarding the inclusion of renewable energies.

CONDITIONS:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:-

- (i) the expiration of three years from the date of grant of outline planning permission, or
- (ii) the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Application for 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 with shortened timeframe, normally imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), seeks to encourage development, due to the pressing need for housing to be provided in a short timeframe, within an area where housing land supply is not currently being met.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Location Plan, drawing no. RL001 (BS), received 14 Dec 2018

Access Design and Visibility Splays, drawing no. 028.0050.004 Rev C, received 6 March 2019

Access Tracking, drawing no. 028.0050.005, received 14 Dec 2018

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

4. Approval of the details of the layout, scale and appearance of the buildings, and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called the Reserved Matters) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

REASON: To ensure the satisfactory development of the site.

5. 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.

6. No development shall commence until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CTMP must include:

- construction vehicle details (number, size, type and frequency of movement)
- a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries
- timings of deliveries so as to avoid, where possible, peak traffic periods
- a framework for managing abnormal loads
- contractors' arrangements (compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage)
- wheel cleaning facilities
- vehicle cleaning facilities
- Inspection of the highways serving the site (by the developer (or his contractor) and Dorset Highways) prior to work commencing and at regular, agreed intervals during the construction phase
- a scheme of appropriate signing of vehicle route to the site
- a route plan for all contractors and suppliers to be advised on
- temporary traffic management measures where necessary

Thereafter, the development must be carried out in strict 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.

7. No development shall take place until a survey of the downstream surface water/land drainage system has been undertaken, which confirms existing drainage arrangements from the site, including the outfall route from the existing pond and ditch system.

Reason: To ensure compliance with National Planning Policies concerning sustainable drainage and to better manage local flood risk and residual risk from public drainage infrastructure.

8. No development shall take place until a Surface Water Construction Management Plan, which shall include measures to prevent turbid run-off from the construction site reaching the road and/or discharging into the public sewer system, has been submitted and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed measures shall be implemented and maintained throughout the construction phase of the development.

Reason: To prevent increased risk of flooding during construction, prevent pollution and protect water quality.

9. No development shall take place until a detailed and finalised surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is completed.

Reason: To prevent increased risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality.

10. No development shall take place until details of maintenance and management of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme 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 increased risk of flooding.

11. No development shall commence until written agreement has been received from Wessex Water, and in turn submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority, confirming that capacity can be made available for new connections to the foul drainage network.

Reason: To ensure appropriate capacity is first secured to manage foul drainage from the development.

12. No development shall commence until a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement shall have been produced, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall 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 be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement.

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

13. The development shall comprise of no more than 61 dwellings.

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

14. Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, 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 first submitted to, and agreed 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.

15. Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, a scheme showing precise details of the proposed cycle parking facilities shall have first been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the agreed details, and made available for use prior to the occupation of the 30th dwelling. Thereafter, they shall be maintained, kept free from obstruction, and made available for the purposes specified.

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

16. Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, the following works must have been constructed to the specification of the Local Planning Authority:

The realignment of Burton Street and associated highway works, as shown on Dwg No 028.0050.004 Rev C (or similar scheme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority).

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

17. Prior to the occupation of the 1st dwelling, a Travel Strategy must first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority. The strategy should include measures to reduce the need to travel to and from the site by private transport and the timing of such measures. Thereafter, the strategy must be implemented in accordance with the details as approved.

Reason: In order to reduce or mitigate the impacts of the development upon the local highway network and surrounding neighbourhood by reducing reliance on the private car for journeys to and from the site.

18. Details submitted pursuant to any reserved matters application shall include exceedance measures, and a timetable for their implementation.

Reason: To ensure that the development is resilient to climate change and to ensure residual flood risk from infrastructure failure is managed appropriately.

19. Prior to the occupation of the 1st dwelling, all measures set out in the Biodiversity Mitigation & Enhancement Plan submitted by Lindsay Carrington Ecological Services dated 18th February 2019, as certified by Dorset County Council Natural Environment Team, shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure that the development conserves and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

20. Prior to the construction of the foundation of any dwelling, a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP shall include ecological enhancements, habitat creation and retained habitat features, together with details of maintenance of habitat/ecological features for a period of not less than 5 years. Such scheme shall be implemented immediately following commencement of the works, or as may be agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development conserves and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

21. Prior to occupation of the 1st dwelling, a landscaping and tree planting scheme shall have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme shall include details of all tree, shrub and hedge planting, including details of species, sizes, and densities of plants. In addition, it shall include a long term management plan for all trees and landscaping which are to be retained and/or proposed at the site, together with provision for the maintenance and replacement as necessary of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 5 years. Such scheme shall be implemented during the planting season November - March inclusive, immediately following commencement of the works, or as may be agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape, in the interest of safeguarding the visual amenity and landscape qualities of the area.

22. Prior to occupation of the 1st dwelling, full details of hard landscape proposals, including surfacing and boundary treatments, shall have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, development shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed.

REASON: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of hard landscaping, in the interest of safeguarding the visual amenity and landscape qualities of the area.

23. No external street lighting shall be erected on site, until a scheme showing the precise details of external lighting (including appearance, light intensity and orientation) shall have first been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, any street lighting shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: In the interests of safeguarding the rural amenity of the area.

24. Prior to the construction of the foundation of any dwelling, details of the finished floor levels of the buildings shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such levels shall be relative to an ordnance datum or such other fixed feature as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity

25. Prior to the construction of any attenuation pond, details of depths, gradients, and any associated structures shall have first have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, development shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed.

REASON: in the interests of visual amenity

26. Prior to the construction of any part of the development above damp proof course level details of the number and location of charging points for plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations, within the development, along with a timetable for their provision, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable.

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

Reasons for the Decision

In the 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 in this case is considered to be sustainable and the proposal is not considered to result in significant harm the visual or residential amenity of the area, historic or natural features, or highway safety. There are no material reasons to warrant the refusal of this application and the application is recommended for approval. The previous committee decision to grant consent forms a material planning consideration. With the exception of the NHS Trust contribution no longer being sought by the Council, due to this not meeting the tests as set out in the NPPF, there are no other material changes to the application which would warrant a change in recommendation.

