

Northern Area Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, 4 August 2026
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: Stour Hall - The Exchange, Old Market Hill, Sturminster Newton, DT10 1FH

Members (Quorum: 6)

Richard Crabb (Chair), Carl Woode (Vice-Chair), Alex Brenton, Barrie Cooper, Les Fry, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout and Steve Murcer

Chief Executive: Catherine Howe, County Hall, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 1XJ

For more information about this agenda please contact Democratic & Governance Services Meeting Contact 01305 224877 - john.miles@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting, apart from any items listed in the exempt part of this agenda. If you would like to attend this meeting and have any specific requirements please contact the Democratic Services Officer named above.

For easy access to all the council's committee agendas and minutes download the free public app called Modern.Gov for use on any iPad, Android, and Windows tablet. Once downloaded select Dorset Council.

Agenda

Item		Pages
10.	NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES FOR 30 JUNE 2026.	3 - 56

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2026.

This page is intentionally left blank



NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 30 JUNE 2026

Present: Cllrs Richard Crabb (Chair), Carl Woode (Vice-Chair), Alex Brenton, Barrie Cooper, Les Fry, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout and Steve Murcer

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting): Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)), Cheryl Barlow (MRICS Principal Surveyor District Valuer Services), Penny Canning (Lead Project Officer), Alison Curtis (Development Team Leader), Jane Green (Planning Officer), Claire Lewis (Planning Officer), Louis Wicks (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice), Sarah Baines (Senior Conservation and Design Officer), Ollie Brewer-Hughes (Planning Officer), John Miles (Democratic and Governance Officer), Lucie Bruce (Senior Conservation and Design Officer) and Bo Walsh (Senior Tree Officer).

Also present: Cllr Shane Bartlett

133. **Apologies**

No apologies for absence were received at the meeting.

134. **Declarations of Interest**

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

135. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14th April 2026 were confirmed and signed.

136. **Registration for public speaking and statements.**

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.

137. **P/FUL/2024/04104, Land South Of, Athelhampton Road, Puddletown**

With the aid of a visual presentation, including site plans, aerial photographs and site photographs, the Case Officer identified the location of the application site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies.

Members were shown photographs of the site, views of the surrounding area and the wider site context. The Case Officer explained that the site was located on the

southern edge of Puddletown, south of Athelhampton Road, within walking distance of local facilities and schools. A public footpath runs adjacent to the site and, as part of the development, improvements would be made to pedestrian connectivity, including enhanced walking and cycling access.

The proposed landscaping included a tree belt along the site boundary. Members were advised that, due to the separation distance, the proposal would not result in harm to the setting of the Grade I listed church. It was also considered that there would be no unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, with the development designed to minimise impacts on neighbouring properties.

The site is located on the edge of the Conservation Area and within the Poole Harbour Nutrient Catchment Area. The Case Officer outlined how the layout and landscaping had been designed to maintain key views from Athelhampton Road and Little Copse. Parking would be provided alongside the dwellings, with hedgerow planting forming a buffer to the wider landscape beyond.

Public Participation

Steve Clark of Wyatt Homes (Senior Manager for Wyatt Homes)

He explained to the Committee that Wyatt Homes is a Dorset based home builder, with a proud track record of delivering high quality developments. He informed that Wyatt homes take the same commitment to design, quality and placemaking across all sites, and the scheme before the Committee today was no exception. Wyatt Homes had been actively involved in the site for several years and engaged extensively through the Puddle Town neighbourhood planning process. Wyatt Homes had worked positively and constructively with the Council officers, to respond to their comments and there were no objections to the application. The Parish Council objection solely related to the affordable housing provision. The layout and appearance of the homes had been designed to sit comfortably between existing buildings within the village. The layout presented an attractive frontage onto Athelhampton Road with dwellings set back behind grass verges and hedge rows. A large area of open space with drainage attenuation and play facilities would be provided at the entrance of development with an attractive walking route located around the landscape boundaries of the site. Biodiversity net gain would be achieved with an uplift of 11.9%. Parking would be provided in courtyards, and garages with some visitor spaces provided on streets separated by tree planting to avoid car dominance. The proposal would see the delivery of 28 much needed new homes, meeting the needs of those looking to get on the housing ladder as well as growing families and for those looking to be nearby shops and services within the village. Since the time of allocation, Wyatt homes had seen many changes within the planning system, development industry and general economy which had resulted in unprecedented viability pressures.

As a result, it has been necessary to submit a viability assessment which had been independently reviewed by the district valuer on behalf of Dorset Council. This concluded that the scheme could only viably make an off-site, contribution of £72,000 towards affordable housing. The proposal would, however, still provide small homes, including two one-bedroom flats or two bed room flats and seven two bedroom houses. Helping to broaden the range of housing available locally and provide a more affordable choice, where this type of accommodation was

currently limited. The development would also generate approximately, £498,000 seal receipt and £50,000 in section 278 improvement works which would contribute towards local infrastructure. All homes would be built to high energy efficiency standards, incorporating, heat pumps, solar panels, EV charging points, and high levels of insulation. Helping to reduce running costs for residents, while supporting climate objectives. Officers conclude that on balance, the proposed development was considered to be in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole.

Members questions and comments

- A Member queried the suitability of the site and noted its proximity to local bus stops and services. Questions were raised regarding the gradients of the proposed attenuation ponds, whether these would be fenced, and the measures proposed to ensure safety and ease of access.
- A Member referred to the proposed housing mix and noted the absence of bungalows. Given the demographics of Puddletown and the demand for homes suitable for downsizing, the Member queried whether more single-storey accommodation could be provided.
- Questions were also raised regarding the number of accessible and adaptable dwellings proposed within the scheme.
- Concern was expressed regarding the level changes across the site, with a member noting an approximate 15-metre difference in levels. It was hoped that the design of paths and access routes would ensure gradients were suitable and accessible for residents.
- A comment was made that it was often the smaller details that contributed to the creation of successful and sustainable communities and indicated support for the application.
- Members welcomed the detailed officer report. Whilst acknowledging that the absence of affordable housing made applications of this nature more difficult to support, a Member considered that the justification had been clearly explained. The design, layout and placemaking aspects of the scheme were praised, with the development viewed as creating a place rather than simply delivering housing.
- Members agreed that the proposal was a well-considered and well-designed development which would provide a sustainable form of growth.
- A Member suggested that biodiversity enhancements could be strengthened through the provision of swift bricks and nesting opportunities for birds within the development.
- Support was expressed for the inclusion of swift bricks, and Members discussed whether this could be secured as an amendment or additional provision within the approved scheme.

Officers provided the following responses to questions from members:

- For drainage the Eastern basin would have a depth of 1.6 meters but that was graded by 0.2 meters every 0.6 meters. The gradient would be well graded to ensure it would be suitable and safe. The second basin would be slightly larger and would be permanently partially filled with water, so that flows could be controlled at the overflow network.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Jones, and seconded by Cllr Jespersen.

Decision: To grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

138. **WD/D/19/002710, Land at The George Albert Hotel & Southern Counties Leisure, Long Ash Lane, Wardon Hill, Dorchester, DT2 9PW**

With the aid of a visual presentation, including site plans, aerial photographs and photographs of the existing site, the Case Officer identified the application site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning considerations.

Members were advised that the site was located off the A37 and benefitted from an established access, forming the main entrance into the wider George Albert Hotel site. The Case Officer explained the site's extensive planning history and historical use, including military-related activities during the Second World War. The wider site currently comprised a mix of uses, including the George Albert Hotel and conference facilities, a gun shop, tea rooms, an antique shop, areas of car parking, a touring caravan site, a static caravan area, a former shooting ground and adjoining agricultural land.

The proposal sought the redevelopment of part of the site to provide 226 holiday lodges. Existing static caravans, ancillary buildings and former shooting ground structures would be removed as part of the development, resulting in a more coherent and visually attractive site arrangement. The layout incorporated recreational walking routes, ecological enhancement areas and significant landscape planting. Agricultural land would be converted to habitat creation and ecological enhancement areas, with substantial planting proposed within landscape buffer zones to strengthen the site's setting and biodiversity value. Ecological buffers would be established around key areas of the site.

Members were shown the proposed drainage strategy, which included a replacement package treatment plant, sustainable drainage features, soakaways and two ponds. The site was located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore at low risk of flooding. Whilst some isolated surface water pooling had been identified, the Case Officer advised that an appropriate drainage strategy could be achieved.

The proposal also included a new clubhouse building, the continued use of an existing building currently associated with the motor circuit, a new amenity lake and a wildlife pond. Cross-sectional drawings of the ponds were presented, which demonstrated shallow side slopes and gradual gradients designed to ensure safety without the need for perimeter fencing.

The existing site entrance was highlighted, together with proposals to reduce the urbanising appearance of certain areas and restore a more rural character to parts of the access route. Members were also shown the George Albert Hotel complex, conference facilities, touring caravan site, commercial uses and the former Second

World War water tower, which had ecological importance as a bat roost and would be retained. The removal of a telecommunications mast from the site was also noted.

The Case Officer explained that the site occupied a relatively elevated position but was generally well contained within the landscape, with limited opportunities for significant public views into the development. Key planning considerations included the loss of existing recreational facilities associated with the clay pigeon shooting ground and motor racing activities, the provision of staff accommodation on site, landscape and visual impacts, ecology, drainage and the overall principle of tourism-related development.

Public Participation

Dan Parker (The Head of Motorsport, UK)

He explained that Motorsport, UK was the national body governing for all four - wheel motorsports in the UK. He objected and raised concerns about the proposed application in so far of the loss of material restriction of the Clay Pigeon Raceway which is an established motorsport venue. Pigeon Raceway is not simply an area of land with an alternative potential use. It is a long-established Motorsport karting circuit with significant community and heritage value. The venue has played an important role in British karting for decades and has supported the development of competitors, officials, volunteers, clubs and all their families across the Southwest and far beyond. He explained that circuits of this type are very specialist sporting facilities, and they are not easy or impossible to replace. They require the right layout of land and infrastructure, all of which is licenced by Motorsports UK. Motorsports UK has around 35 venues licensed in the UK for use and only around 6 or 7 of these which can host the type of events Clay Pigeon Raceway hosts. He explained that if a venue like the Clay Pigeon is lost, there may not be another equivalent facility could be replicated elsewhere. An alternative premises had been highlighted as a possible alternative venue but has significant challenges with planning and use and would become very difficult for the pathway in karting to operate. karting is the entry point into motorsports which means predominately it is for young people, where they learn development and engineering and volunteering for the community is actively apart of karting. The sport would simply not cope with just one venue in the Southwest of the Country. Clay Pigeon has made a significant impact in the karting world. All of today's F1 drivers on the grid all took part in karting, at Clay Pigeon Raceway, not just once but for a number of times during their training. Once the facilities are lost, they are rarely replaced. Silverstone has just built a kart track, and that is the first kart track that has been built in the UK for 35 years. The nearest venue is 1 hour away and has significant challenges and has already cancelled events this year because of the difficulties they have with planning.

Lucy Hodge

She explained that the village of Batcombe was less than a mile away from the site and stated that this was the wrong scale of development in the wrong place, with no realistic access to public transport. She said it was an entirely car-based development, at a scale that would bring unprecedented rural through-traffic and new hazards to the A37. She argued that 226 lodges, together with staff facilities, were equivalent to bringing a medium-sized village to this unsustainable location.

She questioned whether the Planning Inspectorate would accept this, given the scant consideration of highway impacts.

In terms of car dependency, she explained that the nearest public bus stop was over 8 km away. Cycling from the site was challenging, even for confident cyclists. Access to Dorset's attractions beyond local hiking would require a car. In relation to vehicle numbers on changeover days, she asked members to imagine over 226 cars arriving and 226 leaving, in addition to vehicles for staff, maintenance, cleaning and online food deliveries, all travelling through the rural road network connected to the A37.

She informed the Committee that the applicant's own Transport Assessment acknowledged 470 two-way vehicle trips per day on weekdays, increasing to 558 at weekends. She stated that visitors would use local villages to avoid traffic and to access local attractions. She argued that the highway response was lacking and called into question whether a safe decision could be made. She asked why independent transport modelling had not been used.

She explained that the applicant's assessment had overestimated existing trips at more than 884 per day. She stated that this misleading figure had formed the basis for a claimed reduction in traffic movements. She added that development creep had largely been permitted during the 1970s and that traffic would be significantly increased as a result of the proposal.

She welcomed the Council's commitment to active travel and noted that rural communities were choosing to walk and cycle where they were able to do so. She argued that ignoring the dangerous impacts on rural road networks flew in the face of residents' best efforts.

She urged members to vote for a deferral to allow a site visit to take place. She stated that developer contributions through a Section 106 agreement should be sought and that the closure of accesses should be enforced. She concluded that there was no public interest case for the development, as the small number of jobs created was outweighed by the significant negative impacts. She asked the Committee to refuse the application for the following reasons: overdevelopment, non-compliance with Section 9 of the NPPF relating to sustainable transport, and non-compliance with Policy COM7.

Jonathan Bird (to speak on behalf of Andrew Graham) **did not attend the meeting.**

Nick Sansom

He addressed the Committee in support of the application. He explained that he had worked with the business since 2009 and had been closely involved in the development and modernisation of its operations. He stated that the business had evolved significantly over recent years and had adapted to changing circumstances while responding to the needs and concerns of the local community.

He highlighted the closure of the former scrapyard operation and its redevelopment as Wardon Hill Business Park, which now accommodated a

number of rural businesses providing services to the local area. He further explained that the former Southern Counties Shooting Ground had ceased operation following concerns from local residents and holiday park users regarding noise and environmental impacts, as it was considered no longer appropriate within the AONB.

Mr Sansom advised that a significant investment had been made in the George Albert Hotel in 2009, which had become an important local employer. Although the hotel had been adversely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, he stated that it was steadily recovering and continued to provide employment opportunities.

In relation to the proposal, he stated that the George Albert Lodge Project would support the recovery of the hospitality business while providing a sustainable long-term use for the brownfield site. He stated that the development would create employment opportunities, attract visitors, and support the wider rural economy through tourism.

He advised that the proposal would also address existing concerns by removing the Clay Pigeon Raceway as part of a phased development, thereby reducing noise impacts. He further noted that two existing highway access points would be closed, preventing traffic from using Wardon Hill Road to the north, a measure which he stated had been welcomed by the Highway Authority.

The Committee was informed that the site was already established as a tourism and leisure destination and that the proposal would redevelop existing facilities to provide a small convenience store, takeaway and café-restaurant. He added that the existing emporium and gun centre would be offered relocation to Wardon Hill Business Park.

In conclusion, Mr Sansom stated that the development was estimated to generate between £4.6 million and £5.8 million of economic activity annually and would provide long-term economic benefits while respecting the character of the surrounding area. He urged the Committee to support the application.

Bradley Newton

He addressed the Committee in support of the application. He advised that he had a personal connection to the site, explaining that his grandfather had been one of the former owners of the Southern Counties Shooting Ground before it was acquired by Barry Crook in the mid-1980s.

He stated that Wardon Hill had historically accommodated a diverse range of businesses and uses and had continually adapted over time. However, he considered that the site now required a new long-term vision that would respect its surroundings while making use of its location.

Mr Newton explained that noise impacts had been a recurring challenge for the site. He stated that the former shooting ground and kart track had generated noise which had conflicted with the interests of nearby businesses, residents and visitors. In his view, these constraints had limited the site's ability to evolve and had restricted opportunities for other uses.

He advised that the George Albert Lodge Park proposal presented an opportunity to address these historic issues and create a more balanced and sustainable future for the site. He stated that the development had been designed to sit sympathetically within the landscape, with landscaping and planting intended to integrate the scheme into the countryside.

The Committee was informed that the South West remained a highly attractive visitor destination, with the Jurassic Coast drawing domestic and international tourists. Mr Newton argued that tourism provided significant economic benefits through supporting local businesses, creating employment and generating opportunities for local communities.

By way of example, he referred to The Mole Resort in Devon, which had developed into a tourism destination featuring eco-lodges and hospitality facilities. He suggested that the proposal offered an opportunity to attract a different type of visitor seeking high-quality countryside accommodation and experiences, combined with access to the facilities and hospitality offered by the George Albert Hotel and the wider development.

Mr Newton stated that the proposal was about creating a visitor experience that would showcase Dorset's rural heritage, landscapes, communities and culture. He concluded that the development would bring investment to the area, create employment opportunities and provide a sustainable future for the site. In his view, the scheme should be regarded as an opportunity to deliver a high-quality tourism destination that would enhance the area and encourage repeat visits whilst respecting the character of Dorset.

Barry Crook (Owner of the George Albert Hotel, Wardon Hill Caravan Park, the Clay Pigeon Kart Track and Southern Counties Shooting)

He addressed the Committee in support of the application. He explained that he had invested in excess of £6 million in the development of the George Albert Hotel and a further £1 million in the clubhouse facilities. He stated that it had become increasingly apparent that, in order for the businesses to remain sustainable, continue to grow, and provide long-term security, difficult business decisions were sometimes necessary.

Mr Crook advised that the kart track was constraining the growth and operation of both the caravan park and the hotel and would therefore need to close to facilitate the proposed lodge development. He reassured the Committee that staff affected by the closure of the kart circuit would be offered alternative employment opportunities within the wider business.

He stated that successful businesses needed to evolve and adapt to changing circumstances and that, where one part of a business restricted the growth and sustainability of the wider operation, difficult decisions had to be taken. He considered that the closure of the karting business would allow other parts of the enterprise to expand, safeguard existing jobs, and create new opportunities.

The Committee was informed that the proposed lodge development had the potential to create up to 160 jobs within the local community, providing employment opportunities for local people and supporting the wider economy.

Mr Crook stated that his ambition had always been to create a lasting legacy for future generations through successful businesses that would benefit both his family and the wider local community. He urged the Committee to support the application.

Jonathan Moore Lambe (Agent Lambe Planning and Design)

He addressed the Committee in support of the application and advised that the application site was a previously developed brownfield site with a long history of development, including a motor racing circuit, static caravan park, shooting ground and, historically, a military hospital. He emphasised that the site did not comprise agricultural land.

Mr Lambe stated that the existing motor racing circuit generated significant noise and was not compatible with the AONB location, nearby residents or the George Albert Hotel, where guests expected a peaceful environment. He also considered the existing caravans to be highly visible, visually harmful, dated and of poor quality.

He explained that up to 60 caravans were already permitted on the site and that the proposal sought an increase in accommodation provision across a substantially larger area. He advised that the number of lodges had been reduced by 27% during the application process and that the proposed separation distances between lodges would significantly exceed the required standards, ranging from 30 to 50 feet compared with the minimum requirement of 20 feet.

The Committee was informed that the proposal represented an opportunity to replace existing uses with a high-quality holiday park incorporating lodges finished in muted environmental colours. He highlighted that the scheme would provide six dedicated recreation areas connected by informal paths and that more than five acres of recreation space would be available, including over 6.5 acres of open space within the north-west corner of the site.

Mr Lambe advised that the applicant had worked closely with the Local Planning Authority and statutory consultees over a six-year period to address identified issues. As a result, he stated that no objections had been received from the Highway Authority, the Environment Agency or other statutory consultees. He further explained that a new package treatment plant would deliver a significant improvement over the existing drainage arrangements and that an Environmental Permit for discharge had been approved by the Environment Agency.

He reported that the Dorset National Landscape Team supported the proposals and considered the development to be a rare opportunity to provide a new tourist facility within the AONB on previously developed land whilst removing features that detracted from the landscape.

Mr Lambe stated that the site was broadly level and benefitted from substantial screening by existing berms, mature hedgerows and tree cover, resulting in very limited views into the site. He advised that all existing boundary trees and hedgerows would be retained and supplemented by additional planting and landscape buffers.

In conclusion, he argued that the proposal would upgrade an existing tourism site to provide higher-quality accommodation, contribute to the local economy and support other local businesses and attractions. He considered that the proposal represented a unique opportunity to secure significant planning and environmental benefits, improve the appearance of the site and provide a high-quality tourism facility. He stated that the scheme accorded with planning policy and asked the Committee to support the officer recommendation to grant planning permission.

Cllr Christopher J Cook (High Stoy Parish Council)

He referred to Chapter 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes healthy and safe communities, and argued that consideration should be given primarily to the established rural community of permanent residents living and working in the area. He expressed the view that the proposed holiday accommodation would serve a transient population with limited connection to the local community.

He questioned the economic benefits claimed for the proposal, stating that insufficient account had been taken of potential job losses associated with existing businesses on the site and the possible displacement of current occupiers of mobile homes within the park.

The speaker referred to information within the planning documentation which stated that the site was unsuitable for settlement due to its remote location, separation from existing settlements and high environmental value. He argued that the proposal would effectively create a substantial quasi-residential development in an unsustainable location. In his view, the scale of the development would be significantly larger than nearby settlements and would place additional pressure on the A37 and the surrounding local road network.

He contended that the proposal failed to satisfy the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and stated that insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate a realistic demand for a five-star holiday park of the proposed scale in this location, which was some distance from the coast and major tourist attractions.

He raised that the development would be entirely car-dependent and would result in increased traffic movements on local roads, with potential impacts on road safety for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists.

He also raised concerns regarding highway safety, stating that the Transport Assessment had not adequately addressed the nature of the site's access onto the A37. He described the entrance and exit as being located on a bend in the road and considered it to be a potentially dangerous access point, noting that a police safety camera was regularly positioned in the vicinity.

Members questions and comments

- Members sought clarification regarding car parking provision, noting the large existing car park serving the site. Concerns were raised about how visitors would access the lodges and whether pedestrian routes would require movement through the main car park. It was suggested that the layout and access arrangements required further consideration.

Questions were also raised regarding waste collection arrangements and the lack of information within the application relating to public transport accessibility. Some Members considered that, if approved, contributions towards public transport improvements should be explored.

- Concerns were expressed regarding the removal of the telecommunications mast and the potential impact this could have on telecommunications infrastructure serving local villages and the site's connectivity.
- Members commented that the officer report had made a strong case that the proposal could result in a net improvement to the National Landscape through the removal of existing uses. However, concerns were raised regarding the potential visual impact of lighting within the AONB. Members sought clarification on the extent of controls available through conditions, including restrictions on external lighting associated with the lodges, and requested further information regarding landscaping proposals and berm treatments.
- One Member stated that they had not identified any clear planning grounds upon which the application could be refused.
- Several Members expressed concerns regarding the adequacy of information relating to car parking provision, site access and circulation, particularly during periods of peak hotel activity. It was suggested that the application be deferred to allow further details on these matters to be provided.
- Concerns were also raised regarding whether the existing car park would be sufficient to accommodate hotel users, lodge visitors and staff. One Member suggested that a further deferral should be considered until full details of parking arrangements were available.
- Members commented on the proposed loss of the racing circuit. While acknowledging that the site was remote and potentially well-suited to such a use, concerns were raised about the loss of a longstanding recreational facility and the contribution it made to motorsport activities.
- Questions were asked regarding the layout of the development, including the location of the reception area and the practical arrangements for visitors checking in before accessing their lodges.
- Some Members expressed concerns about the overall visitor experience and site layout. It was noted that while the site would be screened from external views, the development should also provide an attractive environment for visitors within the site itself. Concerns were raised that recreation and nature areas appeared isolated and that the internal layout could be more user-friendly. The value of the existing race track as a recreational, engineering and skills-based facility was also highlighted.
- Other Members considered that there were no material planning reasons to refuse the application and that outstanding matters relating to layout and operation could be addressed by planning conditions.
- It was also noted that the continuation of the racing circuit was ultimately a business matter and not a planning consideration for the Committee.

In response to Members' questions, officers provided the following clarifications:

- Officers advised that there was currently no dedicated parking provision associated with the existing facilities other than the main parking area located to the west of the George Albert Hotel. The area proposed for staff accommodation currently formed part of the larger hotel car park.
- It was confirmed that waste collection on the site was undertaken by a private contractor and that this arrangement would continue should the development proceed.
- In relation to parking provision, officers acknowledged Members' concerns and advised that a planning condition could be imposed requiring the submission and approval of detailed parking arrangements.
- With regard to public transport, officers explained that there was a request for a bus stop to serve the site; however, existing bus routes generally served nearby villages rather than stopping directly at the site access. Whilst improvements to bus stop infrastructure could potentially be secured, the Local Planning Authority could not control whether bus operators would run services to or utilise such a stop.
- Officers advised that the telecommunications mast currently located on the site were redundant. A separate proposal for a replacement mast at an alternative location was progressing and it was not anticipated that the removal of the existing mast would adversely affect telecommunications provision.
- Responding to concerns regarding lighting and landscape impacts, officers noted that these matters had been raised by the Dorset National Landscape Team during consultation. A revised lighting strategy had subsequently been prepared, and a condition was proposed requiring the submission and approval of a detailed lighting scheme. Officers advised that the strategy included measures such as low-energy lighting and the switching off of external lighting between 11.00 pm and dawn, where appropriate.
- Officers confirmed that a number of the existing internal earth berms would be removed as part of the development, although landscape mitigation and planting proposals formed part of the scheme.
- It was confirmed that approximately 250 parking spaces were available within the main hotel parking area.
- In respect of pedestrian access, officers advised that there was a route running along the front of the hotel; however, this route did not continue throughout the site and further details of pedestrian movement and crossing points would be required.
- Officers also confirmed that electricity for the development would be supplied from the adjacent solar farm.

A vote was taken to extend the meeting beyond 3 hours. The Vote was **CARRIED** and the meeting was extended.

Cllr Cooper proposed to Defer the Application, seconded by Cllr Ridout.

The motion to defer the application was **NOT CARRIED**.

A vote to approve the application was proposed by Cllr Major, seconded by Cllr Jespersen.

Hannah Smith Clarified that if the vote was successful the proposal would be approved with the following conditions:

1. A condition that requires details for marking out of the car park and access through it.
2. A condition to require a maintenance plan for the duration of the development and the removal of the lodges if the use was permanently ceased.
3. A revised condition 35 Prior to first use of the holiday park, final floor plans for the holiday park facilities building (the former racetrack clubhouse) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the facilities shall be provided on site and made available for use prior to occupation of the holiday units hereby approved.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure facilities are made available to support the use as a holiday park.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Major, and seconded by Cllr Jespersen.

Decision: To grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

139. **P/FUL/2026/01516, Julia's House 34 South Street Dorchester DT1 1DD**

With the aid of a visual presentation, including site location plans, proposed drawings and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the application site and outlined the proposed development and relevant planning policies. The Planning Officer advised that the application sought permission for the erection of a life-size cat statue. Members were informed that the statue would measure approximately 38cm in height and would be mounted on a low plinth measuring 40cm square with a height of 75cm, resulting in an overall height of approximately 1.13 metres. The statue would be cast in bronze, while the plinth would be constructed from fossil-bearing Purbeck stone. The plinth would be secured to the ground using stainless steel pins fixed into a concrete sub-base, with the existing flagstones reinstated above the concrete base following installation. Members were further advised that the Honorary Bard of Dorchester for 2025–2026 would compose a poem to accompany the memorial. The poem would be inscribed onto stone and affixed to the plinth as part of the proposal.

Cllr Jespersen left the meeting.

Public Participation

No public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Members noted that the proposed structure was relatively low in height and expressed concern that it could present a trip hazard to pedestrians. It was also expressed that the structure would be positioned adjacent to existing planters. Members sought clarification regarding future maintenance arrangements.

In response to Members' questions, officers provided the following clarifications:

- Officers advised that it was intended to provide an accessible piece of public art. The design would enable interaction by children and would also be accessible to people with disabilities, thereby enhancing its educational and inclusive value within the public realm. The feature would be maintained by the Town Council.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Fry, and seconded by Cllr Jespersen.

Decision: To grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

140. **P/HOU/2026/01352, Black Oaks, 301 Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall**

With the aid of a visual presentation, including site location plans, aerial photographs, site photographs and proposed drawings, the Case Officer identified the application site and outlined the proposed development and relevant planning policies. Members were advised that the site shared a boundary with the Grade I listed Church of St Mary. The site location, surrounding context and development proposals were explained. Officers highlighted the presence of a Wessex Water foul drainage pipeline crossing the site and noted the associated easement area, within which no building works could take place.

The Committee was shown both the original and amended plans. Officers explained that the proposal had been revised to reduce the overall size of the building, including a reduction in depth to approximately 5 metres and a further reduction in height of 25 centimetres. Details of the proposed materials were outlined, comprising a slate roof, natural timber cladding and dark grey fenestration.

In considering the impact on neighbouring amenity, officers advised that the nearest residential property was located to the south-west of the site, with other neighbouring properties set back at a similar distance from Palms Lane. It was considered that the proposal would not result in a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. Members were informed that the dwelling known as *Amanita*

was located approximately 7.5 metres from the development site. Officers also noted that existing natural screening would assist in reducing impacts and that no windows were proposed in the eastern or western elevations, therefore limiting opportunities for overlooking.

The impact on heritage assets was assessed, with officers advising that the Grade I listed parish church was situated on the opposite side of the site and approximately 150 metres from the application site. It was concluded that the proposal would cause no significant harm to the setting of the listed church. Officers also drew attention to a semi-mature cherry tree located to the south-west of the site and a further mature tree identified. Tree protection measures, including protective fencing during construction, were proposed and could be secured by condition.

Public Participation

Scott Black (Applicant)

He explained that he had built his family home and that the property included approximately 3.5 acres of land. He stated that additional storage was required to accommodate the needs of his growing family, including the storage of a small tractor used for grass cutting and other equipment required for the maintenance of the property.

He advised that he currently lacked sufficient storage space and was relying on temporary storage facilities. He informed Members that he had sought informal advice from a conservation officer regarding the design and appearance of the proposed outbuilding. He stated that the proposed cedar-clad building with a slate roof would be more appropriate to the setting than a conventional prefabricated shed with a felt roof, which would require replacement or significant repair within a relatively short period.

The applicant advised that the size of the outbuilding had been restricted in accordance with permitted development guidelines and that it would be located within the curtilage of the property. He explained that concerns raised during the consideration of the dwelling had related to its visibility from the Grade I listed church and the adjoining road. Consequently, the proposed outbuilding had been positioned so that it would not be visible from either the church or the road and would only be seen from an unadopted cul-de-sac track, as referenced in the officer's report.

He further noted that there were a number of other properties in the surrounding area with one or more outbuildings, some of a similar scale, located on smaller plots of land. He concluded by informing the Committee that no objections had been received from neighbouring residents and that only comments had been submitted by a Ward Member and the Parish Council.

Members questions and comments

- Members commented that the proposal appeared to be a well-designed garden room and expressed support for the application.
- Members noted that the proposal had been amended and reduced in scale during the application process and welcomed these changes.

Reference was made to an existing storage container on the site, and Members asked whether a condition could be imposed requiring its removal once the proposed outbuilding had been completed and brought into use.

- Clarification was sought regarding the site layout, with a Member asking whether the footprint of the proposed building, as shown on the plans, corresponded with the location of the existing polytunnel.
- Members confirmed that they were satisfied with the proposed planning conditions discussed during the meeting.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Ridout, and seconded by Cllr Potheary.

Decision: To grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

141. **TPO/2026/0004, Church of The Holy Rood, Church Road, Shillingstone**

Cllr Murcer addressed the Committee as the Local Ward Member. Following his representation, he withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote on the application.

With the aid of a visual presentation, including site location plans, aerial photographs and site photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and outlined the proposal and relevant planning considerations to Members. Officers explained that the item before the Committee related to the confirmation of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Members were advised that, where a tree in a Conservation Area was subject to a notification of proposed works, the Local Planning Authority had six weeks in which to determine whether to allow the works to proceed or to make a Tree Preservation Order to protect the tree. It was noted that the TPO had been made following a proposal to fell a silver birch tree.

The Committee was informed that the tree was located within the grounds of the Church of the Holy Rood, Shillingstone, and was situated within the Conservation Area. The surrounding context was outlined, including the church building, a number of other mature trees within the churchyard and the convergence of two public rights of way. Photographs showing the tree in front of the church and views facing north were presented.

Officers advised that the silver birch was a low water-demand species and that there was no available evidence regarding the specific soil conditions at the site. It was explained that no factual evidence had been submitted to demonstrate that the tree was causing structural damage to the church. Officers further advised that they did not consider there to be sufficient evidence to conclude that the tree was responsible for any damage to the church building.

Members were informed that the tree was mature and no longer in its most vigorous growth stage. As a result, it was not considered likely to be actively seeking significant quantities of water. Officers noted that there was no evidence to establish whether cracks within the church building were progressive, seasonal in nature or the result of a single historic event.

Officers advised that they did not support the removal of a mature tree solely as a means of determining whether it might be contributing to structural issues. It was suggested that further investigation of other potential causes, including the condition of drainage infrastructure and the possibility of leaking drains affecting ground conditions, should be undertaken.

The amenity value of the tree was highlighted, and officers advised that the loss of the tree could have a detrimental impact on the character of the area whilst potentially failing to resolve the concerns that had been raised.

Members were reminded that confirmation of the Tree Preservation Order would not prevent future applications for works to the tree. Any such applications would be assessed on their individual merits based on the evidence submitted at that time.

Public Participation

Anne Powell

She addressed the Committee in objection to the proposed Tree Preservation Order. Mrs Powell emphasised that the Church did not seek the removal of trees lightly and recognised the important contribution that trees made to biodiversity, the environment and the character of the churchyard. She advised that the Church had been pursuing a green space and wildlife plan since 2020 and highlighted recent biodiversity initiatives within the churchyard, including nesting kestrels in the church tower. However, she stated that the Church also had a responsibility as custodian of a Grade I listed building to protect and preserve an important national heritage asset.

She explained that the application to remove the silver birch tree had followed concerns regarding cracking within the church building, particularly to the medieval chancel arch. A conservation architect had recommended further investigation, which led to the appointment of a structural engineer. She advised that the engineer's report had identified the tree as a possible contributing factor to structural movement affecting the church and had recommended its removal alongside other remedial works and ongoing monitoring.

Mrs Powell informed Members that part of the church roof had collapsed three years previously, leading to the need for a comprehensive reroofing project. She stated that approximately £147,000 had been raised locally through donations and fundraising, excluding grant funding, and that the reroofing works were nearing completion. In her view, this demonstrated the importance of the church to the local community. She further advised that additional funds and grants would be required to undertake works necessary to address the structural cracking within the church. She expressed concern that, if the tree remained in place and

continued to be identified as a potential cause of the damage, it could adversely affect the Church's ability to secure future grant funding for repair works.

Mrs Powell stated that the Church was not advocating the unnecessary loss of trees and remained committed to biodiversity. She advised that the Church would be willing to replace the tree with a new specimen in a more appropriate location, working with the Council and Tree Officer to agree a suitable species and position. In conclusion, she argued that the issue was not a choice between heritage and nature but one of balancing both interests through proportionate management. She contended that it would not be in the public interest to retain a single tree if doing so could place a nationally significant Grade I listed building at risk. She therefore urged the Committee not to confirm the Tree Preservation Order.

Cllr Steve Murcer (Ward Member)

He expressed support for the work of the Council's Tree Protection Team in preserving Dorset's rural landscape. However, it was argued that insufficient weight had been given to the protection of the Grade I listed church, which has stood on the site for over 900 years. The speaker noted that Grade I listed buildings are defined by Historic England as being of exceptional architectural or historic interest, of national importance, and afforded the highest level of protection. It was contended that the preservation of a building of national significance should take precedence over the retention of a silver birch tree, which was described as unremarkable and having a comparatively limited lifespan.

Reference was made to a structural report prepared by Derek Williamson on behalf of the Parochial Church Council (PCC). The report concluded that cracking within the church building was attributable to the proximity of the silver birch tree and the drying effects on soil conditions. The speaker stated that, on a precautionary basis, the tree should therefore be removed. The Cllr advised that the PCC had committed to planting a replacement tree elsewhere within the churchyard. This was presented as a means of maintaining biodiversity and preserving the natural landscape, whilst providing a more suitable long-term location for a tree with a potentially longer lifespan than the existing specimen. It was noted that only the upper third of the tree is visible from the Church Centre in Shillingstone and that it is largely screened from other viewpoints by the church building and surrounding mature trees. Within the churchyard, the speaker stated that the tree is one of approximately 15 trees and is not considered a particularly notable feature.

He advised that they had been unable to locate guidance on the Council's website regarding recommended distances between trees and buildings. Reference was made to NHBC standards, which identify the zone of influence of a silver birch as extending to approximately half the height of the tree. He explained that this relates to the area within which roots may affect soil moisture levels and the stability of nearby foundations.

It was further noted that guidance from Leeds City Council recommends that silver birch trees should not be planted within approximately 6–8 metres of buildings, whereas the tree in question is situated approximately 3.65 metres from the church buttress. He reiterated that, when balancing the risks and benefits, greater weight should be given to safeguarding an 11th-century Grade I listed building

than to retaining a tree which, in their view, has a limited remaining lifespan and is not of particular landscape significance.

Members questions and comments

- A Member asked about the age of the tree and its expected lifespan.
- A Member commented that they were surprised the silver birch was considered to be 65 years old given its apparent good condition. It was raised that birch trees can thrive in healthy, well-watered soils. The Member further observed that silver birch trees typically have relatively shallow root systems and suggested that such roots would not usually extend deeply into drains. Reference was made to guidance from insurance companies, which often recommend that trees are planted at least eight metres from buildings. It was also noted that the spread of the tree's crown can be a useful indication of the extent of the root system. It was highlighted that if the TPO was removed, the tree would still benefit from protection by virtue of its location within a Conservation Area, meaning that consent would still be required before felling. It was further noted that the TPO would not lapse until 2 August, and suggested that drainage issues could be investigated and addressed before the matter was reconsidered at that time.
- A Member stated that it should be possible to establish the cause of the drainage problems through further investigation without removing the tree in the first instance.
- A Member expressed agreement with the Tree Officer's recommendation, noting the absence of monitoring evidence and the need for further supporting information. The Member referred to the Conservation Officer's comments and considered that additional assessment was required before a decision could be reached. It was suggested that the tree should be given the benefit of the doubt, as retaining the TPO would not prevent future applications for tree works if further evidence became available. The Member supported further investigation, including drainage management measures and consideration of root containment solutions. The Member then proposed that the TPO be retained.
- A Member commented that the potential risk to the church building could not be ignored and stressed the need for the Committee to act responsibly in protecting the structure.
- A Member referred to the request to remove the tree and questioned the level of communication that had taken place between the Tree Officer, the church and the Parish Council. Concern was expressed that, despite the issue having been ongoing for approximately five months, greater dialogue and investigation had not already taken place. The Member noted that no reference to such discussions was included within the report and expressed the view that the Committee should proceed to a vote.
- A Member noted that the proximity of burial grounds to the church could make investigations into the drainage system more difficult to undertake.

In response to Members' questions, officers provided the following clarifications:

- The Tree Officer advised that the church and the tree had coexisted for approximately 60 years. It was noted that historical planting practices often placed trees closer to buildings than would be considered acceptable today, and that a silver birch would not ordinarily be planted so close to a listed building under current guidance.
- The Officer explained that the cause of the subsidence had not been conclusively established and that leaking drains could be a contributing factor. It remained unclear whether the roots of the tree extended as far as the church buttress. The Officer emphasised that there was currently insufficient evidence to demonstrate a direct causal link between the tree and the structural issues affecting the church.
- The Conservation Officer, Lucie Bruce, advised that her primary concern was the preservation of the church. She expressed the view that drainage issues should be addressed and investigated before considering the removal of the tree, rather than removing the tree first and subsequently discovering that the underlying problem remained unresolved. She noted that damage continued to be evident on the eastern side of the church, including damage to the internal fabric of the building, some of which had not been visible while scaffolding was in place. For this reason, she advocated a cautious and evidence-based approach.
- Officers advised that a trial-and-error approach would not be appropriate in this case. It was noted that neither the Tree Officer nor the Conservation Officer were drainage or structural engineering specialists, and that expert input from the relevant disciplines would be beneficial before a final conclusion was reached.
- In response to questions regarding the tree itself, Members were advised that the silver birch was approximately 60–65 years old and could potentially live for up to 100 years. The tree was confirmed as the only tree on the site protected by a Tree Preservation Order and was situated approximately six to seven metres from the church buttress.
- The Officer further advised that retaining the TPO would not prevent applications being made for works to the tree in the future, should further evidence justify such action. However, if the TPO were allowed to lapse, it would not be possible to make a further TPO on the tree. Officers therefore considered that a precautionary approach was appropriate unless it could be demonstrated that the tree could not be retained.
- Officers noted that, although concerns had been raised regarding the relationship between the tree and the church, they had not seen any expert assessment which considered both the arboricultural and structural implications together. It was suggested that where issues span multiple disciplines, a coordinated assessment involving the relevant specialists would provide a stronger evidential basis for decision-making.
- Officers advised that discussions had taken place regarding the condition of the drainage system and possible repairs. However, Dorset Council was not currently involved in any active plans to undertake drainage works. It was also noted that alternative mitigation measures, such as the installation of root barriers, could be explored as part of any future investigation into the matter.

Cllr Fry proposed that the Tree Protection Order should not be confirmed, seconded by Cllr Potheary.

The motion to not confirm the TPO was **NOT CARRIED**.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Ridout, and seconded by Cllr Brenton.

Decision: To grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

142. **P/LBC/2026/02523, Keynston Mill Lane Bridge, Tarrant Keynston**

With the aid of a visual presentation, including site plans, aerial photographs and site photographs, the Case Officer identified the application site and outlined the proposal, together with the relevant planning policies for Members' consideration. Members were advised that the application related to a historic footbridge located at Keynston Mill, south-west of Tarrant Keynston. The site was not situated within a Conservation Area; however, Keynston Mill was a Grade II listed building dating from the nineteenth century. The Officer explained that the entire mill site, including the footbridge, formed part of the listed structure.

Photographs were shown illustrating the location of the footbridge, which carries a public right of way across the River Stour. Members were shown the area of partial collapse, located immediately in front of the mill building. Views of the southern approach from the public right of way, the northern approach adjacent to the mill building, and the upstream elevation of the bridge were also provided.

The Officer explained that the proposal sought Listed Building Consent for the repair and restoration of the footbridge. The works would involve the careful dismantling and rebuilding of the affected brick arches on a like-for-like basis. Additional structural reinforcement would be provided through the installation of concealed concrete strengthening above the brickwork, together with concealed concrete backing and stainless-steel bed joint reinforcement. Repairs to the downstream headwall and bridge abutments would also be undertaken where necessary, and a breathable membrane would be installed as part of the repair works.

Members were advised that an ecological assessment had been undertaken. The report confirmed that the mill structure supported a significant bat roost and that the associated watercourse (leat) provided habitat for a number of fish species. Appropriate measures would be implemented to safeguard these ecological interests during the construction process.

The Officer informed Members that the public footpath was currently closed due to the condition of the bridge and would be reopened upon completion of the repair works.

The Officer advised that the proposed works had been carefully designed to preserve the significance of the designated heritage asset and would not result in harm to the character, appearance or historic fabric of the Grade II listed building. Accordingly, the proposal was considered acceptable in heritage and planning terms.

Public Participation

No public participation.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Major, and seconded by Cllr Jespersen.

Decision: To grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

143. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

144. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 4.00 pm

Chairman

.....

Northern Area Planning Committee
30th June 2026
Decision List

Application Reference: P/Ful/2024/04104

Application Site: Land South Of, Athelhampton Road, Puddletown.

Proposal: Erect 28 dwellings including access, parking, landscaping & associated infrastructure and ancillary works.

Recommendation: GRANT subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report to delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Northern Area Manager to

A) grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure: - An offsite contribution to affordable housing - The nutrient neutrality mitigation - Viability mechanism - Option to transfer the Parish Council or management company the Public Open Space

Or

B) Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below if the S106 agreement is not completed by 6 months of the date of the permission or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Northern Area Manager. The reasons for refusal for failure to secure the necessary obligations are set out in full at the end of this report.

Decision: A) grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure: - An offsite contribution to affordable housing - The nutrient neutrality mitigation - Viability mechanism - Option to transfer the Parish Council or management company the Public Open Space.

To delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager (Northern Area) to:

A) Grant, subject to the completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in a form to be agreed by the Legal Services manager to secure the following:

- Nutrient Neutrality offsite mitigation
- Affordable Housing Contribution
- Viability mechanism to provide a greater contribution to affordable housing if viability

improves. The viability scheme would only apply to the assessed use and there would be

the ability to reassess the viability upon an application for change of use class

- Option to transfer the Parish Council or management company the Public Open Space

And the following conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country

Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

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

approved plans:

172_DI_11.5 A Location plan

172_DI_19.2 3 Block plan

172_DI_15.14 15 Site Layout Plan

FOG T2-HA-B A Plot 8-9 - Plans and Elevations

QrG5-B-V Quadruple Garage plans and elevations

Bra-B-C Plot 15 - Plans and elevations

Gla-B-C Plot 16 - Plans and elevations

Pul-BF-I A Plot 17 - Plans and elevations

4-2679-Spec2-B-Plot 18 Plot 18 - Plans and elevations

4-2292-Barn-BF A Plot 19 - Plans and elevations

Bry-B-C-Bra-BF-C-Spe Plot 20-22 Plans and elevations

Kno-B-C-lwe-B-l1-V A Plot 23-24 Plans and elevations

TwG2-B-V Twin Garage Plans and elevations

Ibb-B-C-Kin-B-C-V Plot 25-26 Plans and elevations

Reg-B-C-V Plot 27 Plans and elevations

Mor-BF-C-V Plot 28 Plans and elevations

FB-HA-B-Spec A Plot 1-4 Plans and elevations

Kno-BF-C-Gla-B-C-CP-Gla-BS-C Plot 10-12 Plans and elevations

Bry-B-C Plot 13-14 Plans and elevations

SG2-B Single garage plans and elevations

1036-HA-BF-822-HA-R Plot 5-7 Plans and elevations

172_DI_18.3 4 Boundary Materials Plan

172_DI_21.2 3 Building Heights Plan

172_DI_22.2 3 Dwelling Mix Plan

172_DI_20.2 3 Parking Layout Plan

172_DI_17.4 5 Roof Plan

172_DI_23.4 5 Scheme Masterplan

01-PDL-1001 B Preliminary drainage layout

01-PDL-1002 B Preliminary off-site stormwater outfall

813.44 / 09G Landscape General Arrangement

01-PHL-2001 C Preliminary Access Plan

01-ATR-101 B Vehicular Swept Path Analysis - Refuse

01-PHL-3003 B Preliminary site levels - highway profiles

01-PHL-3002 D Preliminary site levels - Sheet 2 of 2

01-PHL-3001 D Preliminary site levels - Sheet 1 of 2

01-ATR-102 B Vehicular swept path analysis - fire tender

01-PHL-2002 B Proposed highway adoption plan

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

3. Before the development hereby approved commences a Construction Traffic Management

Plan (CTMP) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The

CTMP must include:

- 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
- location of construction site access
- 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

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

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

4. Prior to the commencement of the development, hereby approved, a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and providing clarification of how drainage is to be managed during construction and a timetable for implementation of the scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details including the timetable for implementation.

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

5. Prior to the commencement of the development, hereby approved, details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system 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 shall 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 the future maintenance of the surface water drainage system, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

6. Prior to the commencement of the development, hereby approved, a site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan must demonstrate the adoption and use of the best practicable means to reduce the effects of noise, vibration, dust, emissions and site lighting. The plan shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison
2. Arrangements for liaison with the Council's Pollution Control Team
3. All works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary, or at such other place as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be carried out only between the following hours:
 - 08:00 Hours and 18:00 Hours on Mondays to Fridays
 - 08:00 Hours and 13:00 Hours on Saturdays
 - at no time on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays.
4. Deliveries to and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed above.
5. Mitigation measures as defined in BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 shall be used to minimise noise disturbance from construction works.
6. Procedures for emergency deviation of the agreed working hours.
7. Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants. This must also take into account the need to protect any local resident who may have a particular susceptibility to air-borne pollutants.
8. Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes.

Reason: To mitigate, and reduce to a minimum, adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from pollution as described within paragraphs 198-201 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).

7. Prior to the commencement of development above damp-proof course level, details (including colour photographs) of all external facing materials for the walls and roofs of the proposed dwellinghouses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as have been agreed.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

8. Prior to the commencement of development above damp-proof course level, details (including colour photographs) of all boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as have been agreed.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

9. Prior to the commencement of development above damp course level, hereby approved, a soft landscaping and planting scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full during the first planting season November - March following commencement of the development or within a timescale to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include provision for the maintenance and replacement as necessary of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 10 years.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

10. Prior to the commencement of development above damp course level, hereby approved full details of hard landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include where appropriate : proposed finished levels or contours, means of enclosure, car parking layout, other vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation areas, hard surfacing materials, minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, signs, lighting, refuse or other storage units, proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communication cables, pipelines, etc, indicating lines, manholes, supports etc), retained historic landscape features and proposals for their restoration where relevant. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

11. Prior to the installation of the proposed air source heat pumps, details of the noise levels of the proposed air source heat pumps should be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall confirm whether the proposed heat pumps comply with MCS Standards and the exact positions of the proposed air source heat pumps should be provided.

Reason: In order to protect the living conditions of surrounding residential properties.

12. Prior to the first occupation of the development, hereby approved, details of measures to limit the potential consumption of wholesome water use by persons occupying the new dwelling to 120 litres per person per day as measured in accordance with regulation 36 of the Approved Document for Part G2 of the Building Regulations 2010 (or any equivalent regulation revoking and/or re-enacting that Statutory Instrument) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include a water consumption calculation for the dwelling in accordance with the Approved Documents referred to above. The approved measures shall be implemented and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To secure nutrient neutrality through effective mitigation in the interests of protected Habitat Sites

13. Before the development is occupied or utilised the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shown on Drawing Number 172_DI_15.16 must be constructed. Thereafter, these must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

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

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

- Footway widening along the site frontage;
- Enhancement of the Athelhampton Road gateway feature and traffic calming measures;
- Relocation and upgrading of bus stops, including shelters and passenger facilities;
- Provision of pedestrian crossing facilities on Athelhampton Road; and
- Improvements to the Milom Lane junction, including narrowing of the bellmouth and pedestrian crossing provision. (broadly in accordance with drawings 01-PHL-2001 B and agreed with the Planning

Authority).

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

15. Before the development hereby permitted is occupied, details of the tactile paving at pedestrian crossing points within the internal layout of the estate road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To provide safe and suitable crossing points within the internal layout of the estate road to align with Inclusive Mobility guidance.

16. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised, the submitted Travel Plan must be implemented and operational.

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.

17. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the recommendations and requirements in the ecology report titled Ecological Appraisal, by Hankinson Duckett Associates and dated July 2024.

The development hereby approved must not be first brought into use unless and until:

i) the recommendations detailed in section 8 of the approved ecology report have been completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority (LPA), and

ii) written evidence demonstrating compliance has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the approved ecology report and thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

18. No works shall commence on site (other than those required by this condition) on the development hereby permitted until the first 15.00m of the proposed access road, including the junction with the existing public highway, has been completed to at least binder course level.

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.

Informative Notes:

1. In addition to this permission, the junction works referred to in the condition above must be carried out to the specification and satisfaction of the Highway Authority in consultation with the Planning Authority and it will 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. The applicant should contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email at highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

2. The applicant is advised that, notwithstanding this consent, if it is intended that the highway layout be offered for public adoption under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980, the applicant should contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by telephone at 01305 225401, by email at highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

3. The applicant should be advised that the Advance Payments Code under Sections 219 225 of the Highways Act 1980 may apply in this instance. The Code secures payment towards the future making-up of a private street prior to the commencement of any building works associated with residential, commercial and industrial development. The intention of the Code is to reduce the liability of potential road charges on any future purchasers which may arise if the private street is not made-up to a suitable standard and adopted as publicly maintained highway. Further information is available from Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They

can be reached by email highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

4. In addition to this permission, the highway improvement(s) 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 will 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. The applicant should contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email at highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ. available

5. The developer is responsible for coordinating and booking their own road space for utilities and construction works to minimise disruption to the highway network. Guidance is here: <https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/highway-works-for-newB>

Application Reference: Wd/D/19/002710

Application Site: Land At The George Albert Hotel & Southern Counties Leisure, Long Ash Lane, Wardon Hill, Dorchester, DT2 9PW.

Proposal: Change of use of the land & erection of Holiday Lodges & Staff Accommodation units, together with installation of infrastructure to form a Holiday Lodge Park in lieu of the current land use of motor racing circuit, shooting ground & static caravan park.

Recommendation: To grant planning permission subject to conditions, as set out in para 16 of the report.

Decision: To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions added by the Planning Committee:

A revised condition 35 Prior to first use of the holiday park, final floor plans for the holiday park facilities building (the former racetrack clubhouse) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the facilities shall be provided on site and made available for use prior to occupation of the holiday units hereby approved.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure facilities are made available to support the use as a holiday park.

36. Prior to the occupation of the holiday lodges hereby approved, details of the layout of the car park serving the site (located immediately west of the George Albert

Hotel) and the vehicular access route to the lodges within the southern portion of the site, shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall accord with the hard landscape details agreed at condition 19. Thereafter, and prior to occupation of the units hereby approved, the car park and access route shall be laid out in accordance with the details as have been agreed, and shall be kept free from obstruction and made available for its intended use for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

37. On cessation of the use of the site as a holiday park, the lodges hereby permitted shall be removed from the land in accordance with a timetable to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

38. Prior to the occupation of the holiday lodges hereby approved, a Maintenance Schedule for the lodges shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

Conditions set out in the officer's report:

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

Location Plan, drawing no. LP/1.3, received 04 Mar 21

Proposed Holiday Lodge Layout Plan, over existing topography plan, drawing no. GAH/C2.9-2, received 16 Jun 25

Proposed Holiday Lodge Layout Plan, drawing no. GAH/C2.9, received 16 Jun 25

Land Survey: Buildings and Structures to be demolished, received 10 Mar 26

Artisan Lode 3 Bed (staff accommodation) Floor Plans and Elevations, received 16 Sep 21

Bella Vista 2Bed Floor Plans and Elevations, received 1 Nov 19

Bella Vista 3Bed Floor Plans and Elevations, received 1 Nov 19

Waste Water Treatment Plant - Plan, drawing no. BB1466-22-101-001, received 09 Mar 26

Waste Water Treatment Plant - Section, drawing no. BB1466-22-101-001, received 09 Mar 26

Cross Sections O-O, R-R, drawing no. GAH/CS5.2, received 03 Feb 21

Cross Sections E-E, F-F, G-G, drawing no. GAH/CS2.2, received 03 Feb 21

Cross Sections A-A, B-B, C-C, D-D, drawing no. GAH/CS1.2, received 03 Feb 21

Pond Section Details, Rev V1, received 23 June 21

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

2. 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).

3. The lodges hereby approved shall be occupied for holiday purposes only (save for those subject to condition 4); shall not be occupied as a person's sole, or main place of residence; and the owners/operators must maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all owners/occupiers of the lodges, their main home addresses, and the date of occupancy of the lodge, and must make this information available within 24 hours of a request by a duly authorised officer of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the approved lodges are not used for permanent residential occupation.

4. The 2x lodges identified on drawing GAH/C2.9-2 as 'staff units' shall be limited to a person solely, or mainly, employed in the Warden Hill/George Albert holiday lodge park hereby approved (including any dependants of such a person residing with him/her).

Reason: The site is in an area where new dwellings would be contrary to the provisions of the approved Local Plan and normally would not be permitted except where there is an overriding need in the interests of a rural enterprise.

5. Prior to the siting of any lodge, details and samples of all external facing materials for the walls and roofs, and associated decking, balustrades, and any steps/ramps, including its finish and colour, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the external finish/colour of the lodge, and associated decking, balustrades and steps/ramps, shall be in strict accordance with the details as have been agreed, shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the lodge, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

6. The lodges hereby approved, together with any replacement lodge in the future, shall accord in size, siting and appearance with the drawings as set out in condition 1 (plans list), and their external appearance shall be in accordance with those details agreed under condition 5 (external appearance).

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

7. There shall be no more than 226 holiday lodges on the site at any one time.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

8. Before the development is first occupied or utilised the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shown on the submitted plans must be constructed. Thereafter, these must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

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

9. Before the development is first occupied or utilised the existing access points on Wardon Hill Road (Dorset Council designation D20701) must be permanently closed and the existing highway vehicular crossings must be expunged and the verges reinstated, in accordance with a landscape scheme to be approved as part of the Landscape and Environmental Management Plan required under condition 17.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate reinstatement of the adjacent highway.

10. Prior to the siting of any lodge, details of the means of access including details of access ramps, steps, and a plan showing which lodges are accessed by which means, shall have first been submitted to and approved 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 ensuring suitable access is provided to lodges having regard to Inclusive Mobility Guidance.

11. No development shall take place until a detailed Surface Water Management Scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and providing clarification of how drainage is to be managed during construction and a timetable for implementation of the scheme, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The detailed design of the Surface Water Management Scheme shall be accompanied by supporting ground investigation and soakage testing. The approved Surface Water Management Scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the submitted details including the timetable for implementation.

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

12. No development shall take place until details of maintenance and management of the Surface Water Management Scheme, including any sustainable drainage features, 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 shall include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or

statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

13. Not with standing drawing 'pond section details, Rev V1, received 23 June 21' prior to works being carried out relating to the ponds hereby approved, additional 1:20 sections, showing the north, south, east, and west banks for each pond, and a Pond Maintenance Strategy for the bank edges shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the ponds shall be provided in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed and shall be maintained in accordance with the Pond Maintenance Strategy thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity, visual amenity, and biodiversity.

14. Prior to the installation of the Waste Water Package Treatment Plant (PTP) (to be installed prior to occupation of the holiday lodges hereby approved in accordance with condition 15), a layout plan showing its siting, and details, including materials, finish and colour, of the above ground structures associated with the PTP (including the tanks and kiosk), shall 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: To ensure the satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

15. Prior to occupation of the holiday lodges hereby approved, the replacement Bio-Bubble Package Treatment Plant (PTP), as detailed within the submitted Nutrient Neutrality and Mitigation Strategy (NNMS) dated 12 Sep 2024, shall first be installed and made operational. Thereafter, the PTP shall be managed and maintained in accordance with a Waste Water Management Scheme (as required by condition 16) in perpetuity. In the event the PTP needs replacing or upgrading, the replacement PTP shall have an effluent discharge of no greater than 1.2mg/l total ammoniacal nitrogen, and nitrate of 35mg/l, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To provide appropriate treatment to wastewater generated from the proposed use, in the interests of safeguarding European Protected sites, specifically Poole Harbour, from the harmful effects of development.

16. No development shall commence until a Waste Water Management Scheme, to include details of maintenance and management of the waste water treatment plant, shall 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 shall 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 Waste Water Management Scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To provide appropriate treatment to wastewater generated from the proposed use, in the interests of safeguarding European Protected sites, specifically Poole Harbour, from the harmful effects of development.

17. Details of measures to limit the water use of the lodges in accordance with the optional requirement in regulation 36(2)(b) and the Approved Document for

Part G2 of the Building Regulations 2010 (or any equivalent regulation revoking and/or re-enacting that Statutory Instrument) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the lodges are occupied. The submitted details shall include a water consumption calculation for each lodge in accordance with the Approved Documents referred to above. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to occupation and maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure nutrient neutrality in the Poole Harbour catchment, in the interests of protected habitats.

18. Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) prepared by a qualified tree specialist providing comprehensive details of construction works in relation to trees and hedges that have the potential to be affected by the development must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. In particular, the method statement must provide the following:

- a) a specification for protective fencing to trees and hedges during both demolition and construction phases which complies with BS 5837 (2012) and a plan indicating the alignment of the protective fencing;
- b) a schedule of tree work conforming to BS3998;
- c) details of the area for storage of materials, concrete mixing and any bonfires;
- d) plans and particulars showing proposed cables, pipes and ducts above and below ground as well as the location of any soakaway or water or sewerage storage facility;
- e) details of any no-dig specification for all works within the root protection area for retained trees: f) details of the supervision to be carried out by the developer's tree specialist.

Thereafter, development shall proceed in strict accordance with the details as have been agreed and all safeguarding measures, including the provision of protective fencing, shall be installed prior to commencement of development and retained for the duration of construction works and building operations.

No unauthorised access or placement of goods, fuels or chemicals, soil or other material shall take place within the tree and hedge protection zone(s).

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

19. Notwithstanding the submitted 'Detailed Landscape Design', prior to commencement of development, full details of hard landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

These details shall include where appropriate: existing and proposed finished levels or contours, means of enclosure, car parking layout, other vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation areas, hard surfacing materials and ancillary structures (eg; furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units). Thereafter, the development shall proceed in strict accordance with the details as have been approved.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design and maintenance of existing and/or new landscape features and to clarify the finished ground levels of the development in the interests of visual amenity.

20. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), which carries forward the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment updated Feb 2025, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to the commencement of any development. The content of the LEMP shall include the following:

- a) A soft landscaping scheme and planting schedule to include details of the size, species, and positions or density of all trees and plants to be planted;
- b) Protected Species Mitigation & Monitoring Strategy for all identified ecological receptors to cover the operational phase.
- c) Description, evaluation and conservation objectives of landscape and ecological features to be managed. These shall include a range of enhancement features and habitats for target species including tawny owl, skylark, reptiles, badgers, bats, birds, dormice and invertebrates.
- d) Detailed plans of the enhancement bat roost and swallow nesting features.
- e) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- f) Detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) & management prescriptions to achieve stated objectives.
- g) Details of the proposed ecological mitigation area to be provided at the southeast extent of the site, including a planting schedule detailing species composition and location of planting blocks, management prescriptions, and clear connectivity with the eastern boundary of the site and with Fishers Bottom Coppice.
- h) Type and source of materials to be used where appropriate, e.g. native species of local provenance.
- i) Details of site de-compaction, soil quality, ameliorants, and method statement relating to ground preparation
- j) Timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development (to be agreed in line with condition 30).
- k) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period), to include a list of persons responsible for implementing the works and details of the body or organization responsible for the long-term management of the LEMP, to include ongoing monitoring of the plan and the carrying out of remedial measures.
- l) Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance, to include a schedule of landscape maintenance covering a minimum period of five years following

substantial completion of the development m) Details for disposal of any wastes arising from works.

The LEMP shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that landscape and conservation aim and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning landscape and biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

Thereafter, the mitigation, compensation, enhancement measures and contingencies/remedial action set out in the LEMP shall be carried out in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed and shall be implemented in accordance with the Timetable for Implementation.

Reason: To protect the landscape character of the area and to mitigate, compensate and enhance/provide net gain for impacts on protected species and biodiversity.

21. Prior to the first occupation of each phase of development a report, providing evidence of compliance with the LEMP (including photographic evidence), shall have first been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local authority.

Thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the landscape character of the area and to mitigate, compensate and enhance/provide net gain for impacts on protected species and biodiversity.

22. The off-site ecological mitigation area at the southeast extent of the site shall be no less than 0.83ha of wildlife habitat, located as shown on drawing

'Proposed Holiday Lodge Layout Plan, drawing no. GAH/C2.9. The southern end, as shown in orange on the above referred drawings will be managed for Skylark as per the prescriptions on p40 of the EclA, and the remainder will be planted and managed as wood pasture, as per the prescriptions on p41 of the EclA.

Reason: To protect the landscape character of the area and to mitigate, compensate and enhance/provide net gain for impacts on protected species and biodiversity.

23. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the hard and soft landscaping details agreed under condition 19 & 20 and shall be carried out in full in the first planting season (November to March) following commencement of development of any one phase or within a timescale to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority; and in any case not later than the end of the first planting season following the substantial completion of that particular phase of the development. In the five year period following the substantial completion of that particular phase of the development any trees or plants that are removed without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority or which die or become (in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority) seriously diseased or damaged, shall be replaced as soon as reasonably practical and not later than the end of the first available planting season, with specimens of such size and species and in such positions as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment, and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.

24. Prior to the commencement of any approved phase of development a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in accordance with the specifications in clause 10.2 of the BS42020:2013 (or any superseding British Standard), and which carry forward the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment updated Feb 2025, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. As a minimum the CEMP shall include:

- a) A Protected Species Mitigation Strategy that covers all activities relating to pre-commencement and construction phases, making clear any phasing between remediation and movement of reptiles between different areas, and any further mitigation required as a result of further investigation into contamination. This shall include mitigation measures for reptiles, bats, badgers, dormice and wild birds and include a lighting strategy for the entirety of the construction phases. The protected Species Mitigation Strategy should accord with the Construction Phase Plan, drawing no. GAH/C2.9-3.
- b) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- c) Notwithstanding the 'Construction Phase Plan – Ecology', drawing no. GAH/C2.9-3, received 16 Jun 25, a final Construction Phase Plan identifying biodiversity protection zones, construction exclusion zones, water tower buffer, reptile donor site and reptile receptor sites taking into account a remedial strategy (as required by condition 22) to manage land contamination.
- d) Identification of areas where invasive species have been identified. An eradication programme for Japanese knotweed shall be provided.
- e) Inclusion of or reference to details for implementation of method statements required to achieve specific biodiversity outcomes, and particularly mitigation measures.
- f) Identification of practical measures, both physical measures and sensitive working practices to avoid impacts during development, for protecting biodiversity through the control or regulation of construction-type activities.
- g) An Implementation Timetable to include construction timeframes, the location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features, and a timetable of visits by specialists where required to be present to oversee works.
- h) A list of responsible persons and lines of communication.
- i) A section defining and communicating the role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW), or appointed ecologist(s) responsible for managing biodiversity issues on site, and times and activities during construction or development implementation when they need to be present to oversee works.
- j) details of exclusion fences, protective barriers and warning signs.
- h) route of construction traffic

Thereafter the development shall proceed in strict accordance with the details as have been agreed, and in line with the Implementation Timetable set out within the CEMP. The Consultant Ecologist shall notify the Local Planning Authority in writing following implementation of the measures set out.

Reason: To safeguard biodiversity as set out by Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, and in the interests of highway safety

25. Prior to the commencement of any development within any one phase, full details of earthworks shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include details of any proposed grading and mounding of land including the levels and contours to be formed, showing the relationship of the proposed mounding to the existing vegetation and surrounding landform. Thereafter, development for each phase shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed for that phase. No development phase shall be occupied until the works are completed for that phase, in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining the amenity value of the area.

26. No soil shall be imported to the site unless it has been tested for contamination and assessed for its suitability for the proposed development. A suitable methodology for testing this material must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the soils being imported onto site. The methodology should include the sampling frequency, testing schedules, criteria against which the analytical results will be assessed (as determined by risk assessment) and source material information. The analysis shall then be carried out and a validation certificate or similar evidence should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in strict accordance with the details as have been agreed.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the environment and in the interests of successful landscape establishment.

27. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved the following information shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

1) a detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be taken to avoid risk from contaminants/or gases when the site is developed. This shall be supported by a detailed soil management and waste management plan, and mitigation measures shall include the installation of a robust cover system, details of which shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, consisting of a design with cover of not less than 600mm depth.

2) a detailed phasing scheme for the development (in line with the requirements of condition 30), defining distinct areas of the development site and the order in which development will be delivered, together with the agreed remedial works (including a time scale for completion).

3) a monitoring and maintenance scheme, overseen by a specialist consultant, to include monitoring the long-term effectiveness of the proposed remediation over a period of time and to determine and report on currently unknown issues with contamination and remediation during development. The scheme shall ensure that site work ceases in the event unexpected contamination is identified or where remediation measures are found to be unsuitable or ineffective, the Authority is

informed of any such discovery, and agreement is reached with the Authority concerning any remediation requirements that arise prior to the recommencement of site works.

The development shall, thereafter, proceed in strict accordance with the remediation scheme, and monitoring and maintenance scheme as has been agreed, which shall be fully implemented before the development hereby permitted first comes in to use or is occupied, and in strict accordance with the agreed phasing plan.

On completion of the development written confirmation and verification that all works were completed in accordance with the agreed details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure potential land contamination is addressed and to mitigate potential harm to health and safety, as well as ensuring the successful establishment of the landscape scheme.

28. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and an investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with requirements of BS10175 (as amended). Should any contamination be found requiring remediation, a remediation scheme, including a time scale, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and on completion of the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be prepared and submitted within two weeks of completion and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure risks from contamination are minimised.

29. Prior to the first occupation or use of the development hereby permitted a verification certificate to confirm that the site is fit for purpose following remediation shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure potential land contamination is addressed.

30. Notwithstanding the submitted phasing plan, no development shall commence until a detailed phasing scheme (in line with the requirements of condition 20 and 27), defining distinct areas of the development site, the order and timing in which development commences within each of those development areas, and the order and timing that existing uses on site cease, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the development hereby approved and the cessation of existing uses on site shall proceed in strict accordance with the agreed phasing plan.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of existing and future occupiers.

31. Notwithstanding the submitted Lighting Strategy, no lighting shall be installed until a more detailed Lighting Strategy has been submitted to, and agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall minimise impacts from lighting associated with pre-construction, construction, and operational activities, and demonstrate how the current best practice (BCT/ILP, 2018) guidance has been implemented. This shall include details such as the following: artificial lighting associated with public realm lighting and any other internal and external lighting

associated with the development. Thereafter development shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed, and prior to occupation of each phase a report shall first be submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, providing evidence of compliance with the Lighting Strategy.

Reason: The purpose of the lighting strategy is to ensure the ecological mitigation areas and boundaries of the site function as dark corridors and bat flight lines (0.2 lux on the horizontal plane and 0.4 lux on the vertical plane), and to minimise light spill within the Dorset National Landscape skies.

32. Prior to the erection of any advertisement sign, where it does not require the express consent of the Local Planning Authority in its own right, details (including to scale plans of the sign, a block plan showing its precise siting, and details of colour, design, materials and any illumination) shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such advertisement shall only be erected in accordance with the approved siting and details and any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair the visual amenity of the site.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

33. Prior to first occupation of the lodges hereby approved, and notwithstanding drawing 178-01-03, received 04 Mar 21, a plan identifying the quantum and location of EV charging points, shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The EV charging points shall be provided prior to occupation and in accordance with the details as have been agreed and shall thereafter be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: In the interests of supporting sustainable transport objectives. 34. The telecommunications mast and other structures on site proposed for removal, as indicated on drawing 'Land Survey: Buildings and Structures to be demolished, received 04 Aug 21', shall be removed from the land in accordance with a timetable to be submitted to and agreed in writing by Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: in the interests of the visual amenity of the site.

35. Prior to first use of the holiday park, final floor plans for the holiday park facilities building (the former racing track clubhouse) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

36. Prior to the occupation of the holiday lodges hereby approved, details of the layout of the car park serving the site (located immediately west of the George Albert Hotel) and the vehicular access route to the lodges within the southern portion of the site, shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall accord with the hard landscape details agreed at condition 19. Thereafter, and prior to occupation of the units hereby approved, the car park and access route shall be laid out in accordance with the details as have

been agreed, and shall be kept free from obstruction and made available for its intended use for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

37. On cessation of the use of the site as a holiday park, the lodges hereby permitted shall be removed from the land in accordance with a timetable to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

38. Prior to the occupation of the holiday lodges hereby approved, a Maintenance Schedule for the lodges shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

Informatives:

1. NPPF Informative: National Planning Policy Framework Statement In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by updating the agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions. In this case, the applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer.

2. Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition (biodiversity gain condition) that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a

Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be Dorset Council.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are listed below.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements is considered to apply.

In this case, the application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

Read more about Biodiversity Net Gain at

<https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/biodiversity-net-gain>

3. NS Biodiversity Gain Plan - Exempt Statutory Exemptions and Transitional Arrangements in respect of the Biodiversity Gain Plan

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and

(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or

(ii) the application for the original planning permission* to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;

ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or

iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development

which:

- i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and
- ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3. Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A “householder application” means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4. Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.6 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

* “original planning permission means the permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates” means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4. Land Contamination

Any work carried out to comply with conditions relating to land contamination must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11’.

5. Land Contamination

The applicant is reminded that to safeguard the site from contaminants condition 23 seeks a robust cover system of not less than 600mm depth be installed. Where permitted development is proposed that could impact the cover system in place, the applicant is advised to seek specialist advice prior to works going ahead to ensure

land contamination is suitably addressed and to mitigate potential harm to health and safety.

6. Invasive Plants

The applicant is advised that there is an area of the site colonised by the invasive plant Japanese Knotweed. Certain plants are listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). This places a duty on anyone undertaking relevant operations such as ground work to prevent the spread of invasive species. Advice should be taken from the Environment Agency / Natural England with regard this species. More information is available on the following website: Invasive non-native (alien) plant species: rules in England and Wales - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

7. Reinstatement of verge

The reinstated verge at the expunged access (that is, the area of highway land between the nearside carriageway edge and the site's road boundary) must be constructed to the specification of the Highway Authority in order to comply with Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant should contact Dorset Highways by telephone at 01305 221020, by email at dorsethighways@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Dorset Highways,

Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the public highway

8. Badgers

Badgers are protected under the Badger Act 1992. Section 3 of the Act states:

"A person is guilty of an offence... by doing any of the following things... - a) damaging a badger sett or any part of it;

b) destroying a badger sett;

c) obstructing access to, or any entrance of, a badger sett;

d) causing a dog to enter a badger sett; or

e) disturbing a badger when it is occupying a badger sett, intending to do any of these things or being reckless as to whether his actions would have any of those consequences" If a badger(s) or badger sett is discovered during works; all work should stop and advice sought from Natural England by calling 0300 060 3900 or Dorset Council Natural Environment

Team by calling 01305 221697 / net@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, before proceeding.

9. Bats

The applicant is advised to obtain either the appropriate licence for Bats issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 55 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) authorising the works to go ahead, or written confirmation from Natural England that such a licence is not required. This is in recognition that bats are protected in the UK by Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and Part 3 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

Further information about the law and bats may be found on the following

website <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/bats-protection-surveys-and-licences>.

10. Informative: This permission is subject to an agreement made pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated ## ## relating to: - A replacement Bio-Bubble Package Treatment Plant (PTP); - The submission of a Wastewater Management Scheme; - Any future replacement PTP; - A monitoring fee.

11. A replacement Bio-Bubble Package Treatment Plant (PTP), as detailed within the submitted Nutrient Neutrality and Mitigation Strategy (NNMS) dated 12 Sep 2024, to be installed prior to occupation of any holiday lodge; the submission of a Wastewater Management Scheme; any replacement PTP; and a monitoring fee.

Application Reference: P/Ful/2026/01516

Application Site: Julia's House 34 South Street, Dorchester DT1 1DD.

Proposal: Siting of a statue depicting Susie the cat on a low plinth.

Recommendation: GRANT subject to conditions as set out at the end of the of the officer's report.

Decision: GRANT of planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

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

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

PP-14787438v4 Location Plan

Susie statue plinth installation

Susie statue site illustrations

Susie statue location outside Julias House shop

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

Informative Notes:

1. Biodiversity Net Gain The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition (biodiversity gain condition) that development may not begin unless:

(a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and

(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be Dorset Council. There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are listed in full in a subsequent informative below.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

- Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

- i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

- ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

Read more about Biodiversity Net Gain at
<https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/biodiversitynet-gain>

2. Statutory Exemptions and Transitional Arrangements in respect of the Biodiversity Gain Plan

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and

- (i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or

- (ii) the application for the original planning permission* to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being: 4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

- i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;

- ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or

iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

- i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and
- ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.6 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013. * "original planning permission means the permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

3. Informative: National Planning Policy Framework Statement

In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by: - offering a pre-application advice service, and - as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this case: - The applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

Application Reference: P/Hou/2026/01352

Application Site: Black Oaks, 301 Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall.

Proposal: Erect garden summer house

Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the officer's report.

Decision: GRANT planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

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

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

P1155-001 B Location/Site Plan

P1155-002 B Proposed Floor Plan

P1155-003 B Proposed Elevations

0500-P2 0500-P2 Drainage Strategy

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

3. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement reference DS/55126/AC, dated 26th February 2026. All tree protection shall be retained until the development is completed and nothing shall be placed within the fencing, nor shall any ground levels be altered or excavations made without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Dated photographic evidence of the erected tree protective measures fencing must be supplied to the Local Planning Authority at least 5 days prior to the commencement of works.

Reason: required to safeguard and enhance the character and amenity of the site and locality and to avoid any irreversible damage to retained trees.

4. The external materials to be used for the walls and roof shall be similar in colour and texture to the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

5. Surface water drainage shall be installed in accordance with Drawing No. 0500-P2 and the Drainage Strategy prepared by Thetis Engineering Ltd dated April 2024. Once implemented, the scheme shall be maintained and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure adequate facilities are provided in the interests of flooding and pollution.

6. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the existing use of the site as a residential dwelling known as Black Oaks, 301 Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall, Blandford Forum, DT11 9NQ.

Reason: The Local Planning Authority does not consider the establishment of a separate unit to be appropriate in this location.

7. Prior to first use of the building hereby permitted, the use of the caravan sited on the adjacent land shall cease and the caravan and any associated structures/works shall be permanently removed from the site.

Reason: To preserve the appearance of the Conservation Area.

Informative Notes:

1. The applicants are reminded that the lawful use of the outbuilding hereby approved is limited to purposes ancillary to the use of the dwellinghouse. Other uses of the building, for example, for independent occupation by persons with no/minimal reliance on the main dwelling or as self-contained holiday accommodation, would be very likely to represent a material change of use that requires full planning permission.

2. Informative: National Planning Policy Framework Statement In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by: - offering a pre-application advice service, and - as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this case: - The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer.

3. Informative: Trees on or adjoining this site are protected by virtue of the Charlton Marshall Conservation Area. Any pruning of the trees to provide clearance for the approved development will require the submission of a Section 211 notice to the

Local Planning Authority at least six weeks before any work is carried out, unless an exemption applies.

You are encouraged to consult with the Local Planning Authority Tree Team or a qualified Arborist before submitting a notice. Failure to submit a Section 211 notice can result in penalties for unauthorised work on protected trees.

Application Reference: TPO/2026/0004

Application Site: Church Of The Holy Rood, Church Road, Shillingstone.

Proposal: To give long-term protection to the Silver Birch tree shown as T1 on the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) map and schedule The tree is considered to enhance the amenity of the area.

Recommendation: To confirm the Tree Preservation Order without modification

Decision: That the TPO be confirmed.

Application Reference: P/Lbc/2026/02523

Application Site: Keynston Mill Lane Bridge, Tarrant Keynston.

Proposal: Take down the partially collapsed masonry arch and replace with a reinforced concrete arch (underneath the track) / reinforced masonry underneath the building wall.

Recommendation: GRANT listed building consent subject to conditions as set out in section 18 of the officer's report.

Decision: Grant listed building consent subject to the following conditions:

1. The work to which this listed building consent relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the consent is granted.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by reason of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

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

- Location Plan
- Existing and proposed plans BS2171-706-01
- Temporary propping BS2171-703-01

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

- Design, access and heritage statement – April 2026

4. The detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement strategy set out within the Bridge Ecology and Biodiversity Mitigation Report, conducted by the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team on 8/06/26, must be strictly adhered to during the carrying out of the works. The works hereby approved must not be first brought into use unless and until:

i) the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed in the Bridge Ecology and Biodiversity Mitigation Report have been completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable.

ii) evidence of compliance, including photographic evidence, in accordance with section B of the Bridge Ecology and Biodiversity Mitigation Report has been supplied to the Local Planning Authority. The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the Bridge Ecology and Biodiversity Mitigation Report and thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

5. During the works to take down the arch, a historic record of the arch shall be made and submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

This record shall include, amongst other relevant details, photographs and description of the construction of the arch.

Reason: To ensure that an adequate record is made in the interests of historic information.

6. Prior to the commencement of work to the brick wall and arch, a sample panel of brickwork for both areas shall be constructed on site and shall be inspected and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The sample panel shall be approximately 2 square meters in size. Once approved the panel shall remain on site until the completion of works and brickwork shall be constructed to match the approved sample panel.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the listed building.

7. Prior to works to the headwall, a method statement/ schedule of works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include a full and detailed specification of all materials and finishes to be used in the works. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved method statement/ schedule of works.

Reason: To preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

8. Prior to the reconstruction of the arch, details of a breathable backing to be installed between the concrete and brickwork for the protection of historic brickwork and shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the scheme shall be completed in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: To protect the retained historic buildings(s) from deterioration by adverse weather conditions.

Informative:

Informative: National Planning Policy Framework Statement

In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by: - offering a pre-application advice service, and - as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this case:

The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer. Case Officer: Sarah Baines NB For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.

The conditions set out in the report may be subject to such reasonable change as is necessary to ensure accuracy and enforceability.