

**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.