

DORSET COUNCIL - EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 30 SEPTEMBER 2020

Present: Cllrs Toni Coombs (Chairman), Shane Bartlett (Vice-Chairman), Alex Brenton, Robin Cook, Mike Dyer, Barry Goringe, Brian Heatley, David Morgan, Julie Robinson, David Tooke and Bill Trite

Apologies: Cllrs John Worth

Also present: Councillors Cherry Brooks, Simon Gibson and David Walsh

Officers attending: Kim Cowell, Elizabeth Adams, Naomi Shinkins, Chelsey Golledge, Colin Graham, Peter Walters, Phil Crowther and David Northover

Public speakers/ Statements/ Representations

Min 135

Martin Barnett, Leigh Merrick, Alan Sewell, Helen Wemyss - St George's Primary School, Kat Burdett and Dr Mary Sparks - Langton Matravers Parish Council

Min 137

Mr and Mrs A Bascombe, James Mitchell, applicant – Lidl GB

130. Chairman's Introductions

Given that the meeting was being held as a MS Team Live Event virtual meeting owing to the need to do so during the coronavirus/Covid -19 pandemic, the Chairman took the opportunity to explain how the meeting would take place, the way this would be done and the reason for this. She explained the protocols and processes to be followed and that doing so give gave the Council the ability to continue to fulfil its obligation of delivering the planning function and determining applications.

The opportunity was also taken to thank Councillors Brooks and Ezzard for their previously valued contribution they had both made to the work of the Committee and welcomed Councillors Heatley and Robinson to the Committee.

131. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councilor John Worth – for the whole meeting – and from Councillor Juile Robinson for the morning session, and Councilor Bill Trite for the afternoon session.

132. Declarations of Interest

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

133. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 August 2020 were confirmed.

134. **Public Participation**

Representations by the public to the Committee on individual planning applications are detailed below. There were no questions, petitions or deputations received on other items on this occasion.

135. **6/2019/0604 - Redevelopment of site including demolition of several school buildings, conversion and construction of new buildings to provide 19 dwellings with vehicular access, off street parking, gardens & landscaping - The Old Malthouse, High Street, Langton Matravers**

The Committee considered an application 6/2019/0604 for the proposed redevelopment of a site - including the demolition of several school buildings – and the conversion and construction of new buildings to provide 19 dwellings with vehicular access, off street parking, gardens and landscaping at The Old Malthouse, High Street, Langton Matravers.

The relevant planning history of the site was outlined, having previously been the site of an independent girl's school and, prior to that, a brewery, (as the name inferred) - with this proposed development being sympathetic and in keeping with the retention of that which preceded it. The development was now being seen as a means of making practical use of this brownfield site and going some way to providing for, and meeting, the housing need of Langton Matravers and that area of Purbeck which had been identified. What original features could be retained, would be, including the distinctive diamond shaped window fronting Old Malthouse Lane.

With the aid of a visual presentation, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how this were to be progressed; how the development would address housing need in that part of the county; and what this entailed. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on residential amenity, Langton Matravers village and the character the area.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of the location, orientation, dimensions – form, bulk, size and mass - and appearance of the development; how it would look – with contextual elevations / visualisation and floorplans being provided for this purpose; the materials to be used; car parking arrangements; where bin storage would be; access and highway considerations; the means of landscaping; where pedestrian accesses would be situated; its relationship with the Dorset AONB and the Langton Matravers Conservation Area; and its setting within Langton Matravers and the characteristics and topography of that part of the village.

Officers showed the development's relationship with the neighbouring residential areas. For context, views into the site, and around it, were shown, as well as along the High Street and Old Malthouse Lane, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

The development was to be of contemporary design – built around a courtyard - but sympathetic to the natural and historic appearance of the village, with local materials – Purbeck Stone amongst them - to be used throughout, there being a combination of dwelling types proposed: ranging from flats/apartments through to a bungalow; semi-detached and detached properties. How the guttering would complement that which could be found elsewhere in the village and examples of how roof windows would look, were all described.

Members noted that before any development commenced, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Transport Plan were necessary and should be applied, this being accounted for in the conditions.

Given all this, officers considered that all material planning considerations had been addressed - with the development being acceptable in principle, of an appropriate layout, scale and design, and also in terms of impacts on the Langton Matravers Conservation Area and the Dorset AONB and accorded with local and national planning policy. The impact on neighbouring amenity and highways impacts were considered to have neutral impacts, given the previous uses of the site, and impacts such as flood risk, biodiversity and trees were all considered to be acceptable. The proposed dwellings would make a positive contribution to the local housing supply with the development making best use of previously developed, brownfield land which would result in a positive contribution to the village. As such, members were now being asked to agree to what was being recommended.

Formal consultation had resulted in Langton Matravers Parish Council maintaining their objection to the application on the grounds that they considered the Purbeck Local Plan second homes policy should be applied; the Vacant Buildings Credit should necessitate affordable housing, the adverse effect on neighbouring residential amenity; access and traffic concerns; the impact of Langton Matravers Conservation Area and the Dorset AONB; environmental considerations; the arrangements for the bin store; and the affect a development of this size would have on amenity in a small village like this. whilst recognising that some initial concerns had been addressed to an extent this was still insufficient to satisfy any objections they had.

In response, officers clarified what had now been addressed to recognise those initial concerns and considered that these were sufficiently satisfactory for them to be recommending approval.

Natural England, Historic England, the Dorset AONB and the Highways Advisor all raised no objection to the application. Moreover, St Georges Primary School welcomed in principle any development that would attract more children to the village and, therefore, more pupils to the school to maintain its viability and vitality.

Moreover, the relationship with neighbouring properties on Old Malthouse Lane had been considered following concerns raised by residents and the Parish Council. Accordingly, given the previous commercial use of the site, officers considered that the proposed residential use would be no worse in terms of loss of amenity.

In considering the representations received in response to the advertisement of the application, concerns raised largely echoed those of the Parish Council. The Committee were notified of those written submissions received and officers read these direct to the Committee - being appended to these minutes. Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that, where applicable, each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

The Committee were joined by local Ward Councillor Cherry Brooks who supported the development, in principle, but asked for clarification on the bin store arrangements and how these would be applied in practice, so as to ensure these were satisfactory. Officers confirmed that there would be a dedicated, purpose built communal storage area which would not only be secure and of sufficient capacity, but be seen to be in keeping with the appearance of the development itself and satisfied Dorset Council Waste Partnership guidance and standards.

Moreover, access to it would be from the courtyard site access, as opposed to Old Malthouse Lane, to address neighbour concerns about this and the containment in a purpose built unit would address concerns about any adverse noise, smell and visual impacts.

The opportunity was given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision. Particular reference was made to the arrangements for the bin store; surface water drainage; pedestrian access, parking arrangements and highway issues and how these would be managed; and what provision was being made for environmental energy efficiency.

Of importance to members was their understanding of what ability there was to apply the Vacant Building Credit provision and the Purbeck Local Plan second homes policy, and how this might be able to be done

Officers addressed the questions raised providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers. As well as clarifying the practical aspects of the development itself, especially the bin store and energy arrangements – for which satisfactory provision had been made - the Highways Advisor explained how the access arrangements were designed to operate and the road safety issues that had been considered and, where necessary, addressed in doing this.

Officers considered it necessary to take the opportunity to explain how, and why, the principles of the second homes policy and the Vacant Building Credit were being applied to this particular development. Whilst the Parish Council

and local representations had emphasised the perceived need for a condition to be imposed to prevent the future occupation of the proposed dwellings as second homes – so as to accord with policy H14 of the emerging Purbeck Local Plan - the recent appeal decision against the Council's imposition of a second homes restrictive condition and award of costs against the Council had now meant that no weight could currently be given to that policy: so a condition preventing the future occupation of the dwellings as second homes would not accord with the Local Plan in force; would not be reasonable or necessary as required by NPPF para 55; and could not be applied.

As to the application of the Vacant Building Credit (VBC), assessments had been made in accordance with NPPF and NPPG policy and guidance and it had been established that the provision of no affordable housing acceptable. In calculating the provision for the VBC, it was established that it did not apply in these circumstances as it did not meet the necessary criteria as the site was previously developed land and that it contained substantial vacant - not abandoned – buildings, with an overall reduction in the built development proposed, by the ability to readily renovate and reuse these as a means of complementing the overall development.

Whilst some members maintained some reservations at certain aspects of the detail - in particular the principle of second homes and the Vacant Building Credit - they accepted this was the case and, the general view of the Committee, was that the development was seen to be acceptable, concerns had been largely addressed and what was being proposed would go some considerable way to meeting the housing needs of the village to ensure its viability and vitality was maintained. However, one member considered that they were still unable to support the application on the basis that the Parish Council's concerns were not being addressed; there was a critical need for affordable housing and the density of the development was unacceptable in this rural setting.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application, having understood what was being proposed and the reasoning for this; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation, the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, and having received satisfactory answers to questions raised, the Committee were satisfied in their understanding of what the proposal entailed and the reasoning for this and, on that basis - and being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor Mike Dyer - on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed - by 9:1 - that the application should be approved, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 17 of the report.

Resolved

That planning permission, in respect of application 6/2019/0604, be granted subject to the conditions contained in paragraph 17 of the report.

Reasons for Decision

Para 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise

- The location is considered to be sustainable and the proposal is acceptable in its design and general visual impact in terms of the Langton Matravers Conservation Area and the Dorset AONB.
- There is not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- There are no objections on highway safety, traffic or parking grounds.
- There are no other material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

136. **3/20/0499/FUL - Erection of a multi-use games area (MUGA) comprising synthetic surface, 3m high perimeter ball stop netting and 8 x 8m lighting columns (additional and amended documents - 6/7/20) at St Ives Primary and Nursery School, Sandy Lane, St Leonards and St Ives**

With the agreement of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman - and in being endorsed by the Committee - application 3/20/0499/FUL- Erection of a multi-use games area (MUGA) comprising synthetic surface, 3m high perimeter ball stop netting and 8 x 8m lighting columns (additional and amended documents - 6/7/20) at St Ives Primary and Nursery School was deferred, to be considered at a future date.

This was to enable a late comment received from the Council's Tree Officers on the management of the trees on the site to be considered and assessed by officers, as necessary.

137. **3/ 19/1767 - Demolish existing dwellings and erect a food store - Lidl - with associated access, parking and landscaping at 76-78 Ringwood Road, Verwood**

The Committee considered an application by Lidl – 3/19/1767/FUL - which proposed the demolition of two existing dwellings and the redevelopment of the site through the construction of a Lidl supermarket and associated development, including parking – for 79 vehicles - manoeuvring, and loading areas, plant, boundary treatment, lighting, and landscaping at 76-78 Ringwood Road, Verwood.

Officers explained that the proposed retail building would be a detached structure occupying the southern half of the site and the parking area would be located at the northern end. Access was proposed from Ringwood Road through the existing site entrance, with the building having a gross internal area of 1700sqm in area, of which 1170sqm would be given over to sales space. The remaining internal area would accommodate, amongst other things, storage, staff facilities, a chiller and freezer areas.

Officers clarified that there were to be 12 cycle parking spaces provided, with 6 Sheffield bike stands; that 64 letters of objection had been received from neighbouring addresses and 3 received with no address; and that a Statement of Community Involvement was also submitted with the application

which included 3648 consultation responses - with there being a large majority in favour of the application.

As to the relevant planning history of the site, whilst the land had been recently used for the display and sale of caravans - as well as accommodating the two residential properties, 76-78 Ringwood Road - an application previously had been refused to build a 64 bed, care home on the basis of its scale, style and bulk, impact on the character of the area, impact on neighbouring amenity, impact on trees. However, the application now being considered had addressed such issues satisfactorily so that this development was now seen to be a means of making best use of this brownfield site and going some way to providing for and meeting the retail need in Verwood which had been identified.

Officers clarified that whilst the category of A1 - shops - was now class E (commercial business and service), as amended 1 September 2020 under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020, there was a material transitional period until 31 July 2021 where the former use class was still referred to and valid.

With the aid of a visual presentation, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were; how these were to be progressed; how the development would address retail need in that part of the county; and what this entailed. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on residential amenity, Verwood town centre and the character of the area. Officers were obliged to consider whether there were any alternative, suitable sites and whether the development would be harmful to the viability of Verwood town centre. Analysis of evidence had indicated that, in both cases, it was their view that this would not be the case. If the proposal had been considered to be harmful to the viability and vitality of Verwood, the creation of 40 full time and part time jobs would not have been considered to carry significant weight to overcome the harm that would be caused. As the proposal was considered not to be harmful to the viability and vitality of Upton town centre, this was one of the reasons for what was being recommended. Overall, the modest economic benefits were seen to be acceptable and should be seen to be beneficial in contributing to economic growth in that part of Dorset in particular and the county in general.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of the location, orientation, dimensions – form, bulk, size and mass - and appearance of the development; how it would look – with contextual elevations / visualisation and floorplans being provided for this purpose; the materials to be used; the layout of the car park and where trolley parks would be located; access and highway considerations; the means of landscaping; where any pedestrian access would be situated; how Ringwood Road could be crossed safely and where the best places to do this would be; the relationship with Verwood Heath; and its setting within Verwood and the characteristics of that part of the town. How deliveries would be achieved was also described. The retention of a mature oak tree to the northwest of the site was also critical in being able to now make the recommendation members were being asked to consider.

Officers showed the development's relationship with the neighbouring residential estates and views into the site and around it, as well as along Ringwood Road, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

In particular concern had been raised as to the impact the development could have on the neighbouring residential properties and amenity - particularly those in Crescent Road - in terms of noise disturbance from intensified use, plant, traffic movements and hours of operation; loss of light; loss of privacy; air pollution and light pollution. This had been reflected in the objections received.

Officers considered that the proposed development would provide a clear economic benefit to Verwood and its surrounding area. The development would generate 40 jobs in the store. This was considered to be a positive benefit to the area. Moreover, a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would be applied to this development so as to provide for enhancements and improvements being made to benefit the community as per the applicant's obligations in being able to proceed with the development.

Given all this, officers considered that all material planning considerations had been addressed and were acceptable, with the development making best use of previously developed – brownfield - land and would result in a positive contribution to the townscape. As such, members were now being asked to agree to what was being recommended.

Formal consultation had resulted in Verwood Town Council not objecting to, and accepting, the principle of the development so as to benefit the viability and vitality of the town. Dorset Council Highways Team raised no objections to the proposal, considering the relevant highway conditions covered all that was necessary. Advertisement of the application had generated both support for and opposition to the proposal: with the considerable majority of representations made being in favour of the provision of the store.

Officers considered that it was appropriate to condition any approval to ensure that, should the company's business model alter in the future, it would not be in a position to sell goods that would have a harmful impact on the viability of other stores within the town centre (condition 3). How convenience and comparison goods available in the store were categorised and what these entailed - in terms of what proportions there would be and what arrangements would apply for their accessibility - so as to be acceptable in any direct competition to that provide in the town centre, was clarified. Members appreciated this better understanding.

The Committee were notified of those written submissions received and officers read these direct to the Committee - being appended to these minutes. Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that, where applicable, each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

The Committee were joined by one of the three local Ward Members, Councillor Simon Gibson, who welcomed what he considered to be a much needed development to serve the needs of the local population with any effect on local established convenience stores being minimal. This store would offer the opportunity for residents to be able to do a weekly sized shop in close proximity to their homes and would attract shoppers from neighbouring rural villages and settlements. He was also supportive of the benefits for employment and the economy in Verwood.

The Chairman, as another of the Ward Members, was also supportive of the application and what it would bring to Verwood.

The opportunity was given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision. Particular reference was made to how the store would be constructed; the design and location of the external plant store and what nuisance this might cause; access arrangements; traffic management, speed limit provision and pedestrian safety; how the landscaping would be achieved; and what impact the development would have on neighbouring residential amenity. So as to prevent unauthorised use of the site after hours, they asked officers to consider the application of a barrier at the entrance to the car park to restrict use of the site outside store operating hours and so as to deter such use.

Officers addressed the questions raised, providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers. As well as clarifying aspects of the development of the store itself and the site as a whole, the Highways Advisor explained how the access arrangements were designed to operate and the safety issues that had been considered and, where necessary, addressed in doing this.

Officers considered that the request for a barrier was acceptable and could be accommodated – by condition - to address any potential unauthorised activity in addressing those concerns Members raised.

Whilst some members maintained their reservations at what access arrangements were being proposed - particularly with an operational garage opposite the entrance - and how, seemingly, these could not necessarily be enhanced at this stage, the general view was that the development was acceptable and an investment, in contributing quite significantly to both employment opportunities and economic growth in the area and would be an asset in meeting local retail needs.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application, having understood what was being proposed and the reasoning for this; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation, the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting in taking account of the views of the two Ward members and the Town Council, and having received satisfactory answers to questions raised, the Committee were satisfied in their understanding of what the proposal entailed and the reasoning for this and, on that basis – being proposed by Councillor David Morgan and seconded by Councillor Robin Cook - on being put to the vote, the Committee unanimously

agreed that the application should be approved, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 9 of the report and taking into account the addition of a condition to provide for a vehicle height barrier upon entry to the site.

Resolved

That planning permission, in respect of application 3/19/1767/FUL, be granted subject to the conditions contained in paragraph 9 of the report, with an additional condition being provided for in respect of:-

“Site security

- details of a vehicle barrier to be installed at the entrance must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the store opening to the public. The barrier must be installed before the store is opened to the public and permanently retained in accordance with the details. The barrier must be closed when the store is not open to members of the public.

Reason: In the interests of security and anti-social behaviour.”

Reasons for Decision

Para 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise

- The proposal is not considered to harm the viability or vitality of Verwood Town Centre
- The location is considered acceptable and the proposal is considered acceptable in its design and general visual impact.
- There is not considered to be detrimental harm to neighbouring residential amenity that would warrant refusal
- There are no other material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application

138. Planning Appeals Summary

Members noted a planning appeals summary in relation to an appeal allowed by the planning inspector in respect of the removal of condition 13 of Planning permission 6/2018/0653 (Change of use of existing buildings, conversion of existing school building, demolition of extensions and erection of 1 1/2 storey extension to form 3 dwelling houses and erection of 6 dwelling houses with associated parking and landscaping) to allow unrestricted occupation of the dwellings at the former West Lulworth Primary School, School Lane, West Lulworth - and the reasons for this - with full costs being awarded by decision letter dated 11September 2020.

139. Urgent items

There were no urgent items for consideration at the meeting.

140. Statements/Representations

6/2019/0604 – Redevelopment of site at The Old Malthouse, High Street, Langton Matravers

Martin Barnett

Whilst I have concerns about the number of properties squeezed into the development site, my main concerns about the submitted plans fall into four main areas as follows:

1. Bin Store

The siting of a communal Bin Store on OML will be hazardous to OHL and new property residents alike. Additionally, the proposed store fails to provide for Mallow, Samphire and Sea Pink Cottages who currently leave their bins in OML. The obvious solution is to allow each property to be responsible for its own refuse (as in OML), and have individual collection, or failing that, to have a communal store in a more central location.

2. Vehicle Access to the Development

The submitted drawings do not appear to accurately reflect the land owned by Number 3 OML, which is opposite the entrance to the development. It merely shows one car parked at the end of their parking space whereas they could legally park two cars outside of their property, thus reducing the width of access to the development.

With reference to the "Swept Path Drawing", the estate car dimensions which have been used do not reflect the dimensions of many cars. The quoted width of 1.804m is surely an understatement when my modest Ford Focus is 2.04m from wingtip to wingtip. Irrespective of the above, if one overlays the "optimistic" drawings they clearly show that two cars (let alone two vans) cannot pass each other at the entrance to the development or further down the access road. This will clearly represent a serious and unacceptable hazard with vehicles having to reverse blind into OML.

The road needs to be wide enough to allow for vehicles to pass, and Emergency vehicles and Refuse vehicles (ref the above) to manoeuvre on site.

3. Junction of OML/High Street

This junction is currently dangerous due to limited site lines and volume of traffic particularly at school opening and closing times when OML is often used by parents. This can only become more hazardous with another 19 properties plus 3 cottages using OML once construction is complete, let alone during the construction phase. Leading onto

4. Construction Management Plan

In my experience, before approval, any such development must submit a Construction Management Plan detailing traffic management, materials storage, post-development restoration, etc, etc. To date I have not seen such a plan.

Leigh Merrick

- People locally support a redevelopment of reasonable scale, proportion & impact within the existing Settlement Boundary (SB), alongside but not in the AONB & Conservation Area (CA). We & many others do as well.
- They value the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), adopted locally too in the PLP & draft successor, to protect & enhance Dorset's outstanding natural environment.
- They know that new housing "range of need" in Langton is massively exceeded by this application & others in train now. "NEED" is not the driver here.
- People are disturbed by the current picture at the OMH Lane junction which is chaos at peak periods and rank dangerous to turn out of otherwise. Add 150-200 extra vehicular movements a day, if indeed the new houses become permanently occupied, and the consequence is a serious safety threat.
- The usable current lane width too will not allow passage of two cars side by side in the first 100 m or so.
- Nor, with High St parking up to the junction itself, can you turn onto it with safe vision, especially to the right. The splay is lethally inadequate and raised over the decades as unnecessarily threatening.
- So, it is no surprise that the current enclave around OMH estate is concerned about the consequences of the scale of the applicant's proposal, about what could be left behind and how it is managed. This matters; motor homes, caravans, cars under repair, boats in an AONB and increasing junction danger onto the High St?
- It will take more imagination and less experience than I have to believe the applicant's management company will control all. There is surely no need to breach the SB and sully the AONB, & CA let alone the NPPF & PLP.
- It does no credit to any of the parties involved to breach & expand the SB, as proposed, create traffic congestion on a single track lane, which doubles as an increasingly well used, pan Purbeck, OS listed Right of Way public footpath, with arguably one of the finest views in England.
- Why do we have a National Planning Policy Framework signed up to by HMG & Regional Authorities? It surely begs the question what are we trying to achieve here.
- May we suggest a modest trimming of ambition, so that the consequences of the application are contained exclusively & totally within the current SB with all parking spaces & bins beside the houses they belong to and access to the new enclave configured to enable two way traffic as far as this entrance.
- Finally, it is disappointing to note on junction traffic that no official has contacted those residents who wrote in December 2019 about the danger but also with a possible solution, having commissioned an independent Highways Consultant from outwith Dorset. This remains available.

- There is a way through this by sensible compromise, which recognises a mid- way path between NEED and WANT which is the real nub of this issue. Stay within the SB, place householders' assets beside their house, widen the lane and ensure legal "no parking" splays up & down the High St are in place. This is what surely should turn this to a green light. The applicant can do this.
-

Alan Sewell

We are concerned that the safety issues around the entrance to the proposed bin store have been ignored and that the Highways input has ignored the ownership of land in the Lane.

Para 15.20 notes "Concern has been expressed over the design of the bin store".....our point is about safety.

Para 15.24 notes that movement of the bin store has addressed "neighbour concerns in relation to access from Old Malthouse Lane". This is not correct we remain adamant that pedestrian safety will be an issue in the revised proposal.

The pictures below of vehicles in Old Malthouse Lane highlight the concern of many residents about pedestrian safety if the recycling/bin store location and direct access to the Lane remain as proposed (hopefully a picture is worth a thousand words).

The Lane is frequently used by children from the local school, walkers and residents.

Using the picture of the two cars parked in the Lane the gap between the vehicles and the proposed recycling/bin store is 12'6" or 381cm and 13'6" or 414cm.

Mr Barnett, ourselves and other residents have, and still, question the accuracy of the swept path analysis referenced in Paras 15.50 and 15.53. Despite this, Highways have relied on the consultant's analysis in spite of several written communications from residents highlighting that the swept path analysis is INACCURATE.

The Officer's report Para 15.49 further demonstrates that inaccurate information is used as it notes the wrong location of private parking spaces in the Lane!

As Robin Hildreth of Dorset Waste Partnership was unavailable I spoke with Mike Haines his manager to ascertain if they have had any response re the proposed capacity of the recycling/bin store as per their consultation input and I still await an answer. (This was communicated to Dorset Planning).

No update to the consultation has been recorded on the planning website. Residents and the Parish Council remain concerned about the capacity of the proposed bin store, and yet the planners have imposed a condition to use Waste Bin requirements 18-1004-BR01. What is this condition and how has it been consulted on?

We are concerned that "pre application advice and negotiation" (para 7.4) between planners and the developers did not take account of neighbour/local parish council input. Indeed local input appears to have no place in this process, a very concerning issue. eg; Parish Council summary para 7 which highlights that bin store pedestrian entrance exit will be at the narrowest point in the Lane and that the plans (and the subsequent swept path analysis) do not accurately show the facts and potential safety issues.

We do not understand why the bins of Mallow, Samphire and Sea Pink cottages already occupied on the site are not included in the bin store and capacity calculations. Has account of these bins and pedestrian activity been taken into consideration?

It is most disappointing that environmental concerns ref para 15.56/57 have been disregarded by the planners. We should be insisting on cycle parking, electric charging points etc. for the future of all our children/grand children.

We support the very many neighbours' comments about safety at the junction of the Lane and the High Street, and the need for a detailed Construction Management Plan.

We are not against the development but would ask that the site of the proposed bin store be modified to a more suitable, safer location away from the narrowest point in the Lane and contained within the site.

Helen Wemyss - Headteacher

St George's CE VA Primary School has been at the heart of the village of Langton Matravers for as long as the village has been in existence, being the third or fourth oldest building in the village. The health of a school is a good indicator of the health and sustainability of a community.

Whilst the School has indeed modernised in recent times, changing from a first to a primary school as part of the Purbeck Review, its future relies on having children to attend. In bygone times, quarrying and farming meant that families lived and worked in Langton and surrounding areas and their children attended the local school. As demographics have changed, with a

lack of new housing in the area, coupled with a drop in birth rate, the number of local children living within the catchment area of St George's has significantly reduced. Our current intake numbers are as follows:
Our PAN (Published Admission Number) is 15 intake in Reception as of September 2019, so x 7 year groups @ 15 pupils = 105 average capacity
Numbers in School 2019-20:

YR: 6

Y1: 9

Y2: 16

Y3: 18

Y4: 10

Y5: 11

Y6: 15

85 Total

Total number of pupils living in the catchment area: 36%

Total number of pupils living outside the catchment area: 64%

Numbers currently in School 2020-21 (TBC at October census):

YR: 12

Y1: 5

Y2: 11

Y3: 17

Y4: 18

Y5: 10

Y6: 11

84 Total

Currently, our School is 20% below its stated PAN capacity, with approx. 2/3rds of pupils originating outside of the catchment area. Our goal is to maintain a thriving and viable School for future generations. The best way to do this is to have more families, from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds, living in the village and catchment area. We generally support the principle of providing more housing in the village with an emphasis on providing suitable homes for families, including a variety of styles and sizes of accommodation. The Spyways development, for instance, is also a welcome affordable development for future local families.

Old Malthouse in various guises has been supportive of our School over the years - providing additional parking for staff and providing play areas for children attending St. George's premises on their land. We have an ongoing and friendly relationship with the current owners, who have continued to be supportive of St. George's CE VA Primary School and have agreed to maintain these arrangements for us with the goal to provide us with a more permanent solution at some point in the future.

Kat Burdett

Thank you for this opportunity to make a representation. I am speaking on behalf of the applicants, in support to the development. I hope that you will have received a letter from me and information from our architect.

We have worked closely with the planning officer, Cari Wooldridge, as well as your design and conservation officer, to ensure a policy compliant development for your consideration.

This is a previously developed site within the village. The site lies entirely within the village boundary, apart from part of an area of existing private car parking, part of which is included within the application site. No buildings are proposed on this land that will remain as existing. The proposed development represents a conversion and replacement of existing built floor area, a reduction in built development. We have reduced the scheme to 19 units from the initially proposed 20. This

allowed a better solution for the provision of a bin store, with access from within the site, as well as other improvements.

We have followed the advice of officers and have guarded against a pastiche approach for the courtyard area, although this is designed sensitively using local materials. The Old Malthouse Lane elevation has been treated differently, to complement the existing building to be retained. Including re-using the traditional diamond windows that are part of the character of this part of the village.

We have needed to ensure that the proposed development enhances and preserves the character of the Conservation Area and have achieved the support of the conservation and design officer, following detailed revisions to meet his strict design requirements.

Overall, there is a proposed reduction in the amount of development on the site and particularly against the boundary with the open area to the rear of the site, where more recently constructed bulky school buildings are proposed to be removed.

The Dorset AONB officer has reviewed our Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment as well as potential for new landscaping. They are content that the proposal is compliant with the AONB Management Plan objectives and policies.

We have ensured that the relationships between the neighbours on the opposite side of Old Malthouse Lane and the site are protected, with greater separation and a building lower in height. We have also amended the access and checked to make sure that the residential laybys on the lane will be unhampered by the proposal. Your planning officer's report sets out a very thorough assessment.

We hope that you will follow the Officer recommendation and grant planning permission for this proposed development, that has been carefully designed to make efficient and sensitive use of this brownfield site, to provide new village housing.

Dr Mary Sparks - Clerk to Langton Matravers Parish Council

Langton Matravers Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds:

1. Local, strategic and national planning policies and policies in the Development Plan.

a) The 'Vacant Building Credit' policy avoids offering affordable housing. This policy does not apply to this development because the buildings are abandoned rather than vacant.

b) The parking area to the North is outside the settlement boundary, triggering a requirement for affordable housing under the Purbeck Local Plan (2012).

c) The NPPF (2019) promotes sustainability for communities. Para 77 says 'In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs'. This development does not, as the main need is for affordable homes.

d) Purbeck Local Plan. All dwellings should all be subject to the Second Homes policy; the development plans do not reflect this at present.

3. Highway issues

a) Transport generation. The transport statement incorrectly states traffic volume: the statement is based on 20 dwellings whereas there are 3 additional cottages fronting the High Street, plus 2 dwellings which will also use the lane as part of the redeveloped Science block. Total traffic movements should be based on 25 and not 20.

b) Vehicular access on the B3069. The visibility splay to the B3069 is inadequate. Traffic speed data on the B3069 is from 2008; speeds will not necessarily have remained constant. The development will result in overspill parking on the B3069 near the OMH Lane junction, close to the village school and on a narrow part of the High Street which is effectively single-lane through much of its length.

c) Vehicular and pedestrian movement and safety in Old Malthouse Lane. Despite revisions, there are still concerns about spatial allowance for the established parking and access to residents' parking on the west side of

OMH Lane, and pedestrian access. There is insufficient space for a turning area to the north of the development. The application requires more robust Vehicle Impact Assessment and Traffic Management plans.

5. Adverse Impact on Nature Conservation interests and Biodiversity. The demolition of buildings which are long-standing bat, swift and house martin roosts will be detrimental to these populations.

6. Effect on Conservation Area/density/visual appearance/design. The development will negatively affect the Langton Matravers Conservation Area, insofar as the density is much too high.

Construction Management Statement. Developers must provide a Construction Management Statement indicating how noise, pollution, vehicle movements and other matters will be managed and mitigated during the construction phase and how vehicle movements will be co-ordinated with contemporaneous developments,

Environmentally Friendly Development.

Plans should include solar panels, ground/air source heat pumps or other types of carbon neutral design throughout.

73/19/1767 – Development of a Lidl food store at 76-78 Ringwood Road, Verwood

Mr & Mrs A Bascombe

Objection

We object on the following grounds:

1. The proposal will result in the surrounding roads being adversely affected by a general increase in traffic and noise from public going to and from the proposed site. Ringwood Rd is already a busy road in, with a garage entrance opposite; Hillside school, The Co-op, Tesco & Ringwood Rd store. Newtown Rd & Crescent Rd will almost certainly be used as a short cut when cars cannot pull out and turn right, which already has a parking problem in work hours, this road has to be used in single file. Black Hill also has its parking problems delivery Lorries from Bradfords parked on the brow of the hill along with cars parked on the opposite side of the road. I am not sure that the surrounding roads have been taken into consideration. Verwood is a commuting town there for if Lidl the preferred supermarket shopping can be done on the way home.
2. Reading the report regarding the Oak Tree in Crescent Rd with T1 protection it appears that the revised plan still puts this tree at risk, it is too close to the root system, and will eventually destroy it.

3. The proposed site is not only in the centre of a residential, surrounded by bungalows. This is the wrong place to put a supermarket; it would be better placed on the industrial park where Lidl supermarkets are traditionally found there is plenty of room there for parking with better access.
4. Looking at the plan there is a MOE GATE (MEANS OF ESCAPE) marked up is this referring to the exit on Crescent Rd There are only six parking spaces allocated for staff, where are they going to park? I am concerned this exit will be used for staff & customer parking. The High way report has concerns that the 73 parking spaces allocated to customers will not be sufficient, & also there is issues with the delivery vehicles accessing & leaving the site.
5. Who would like a car park at the bottom of their garden, with associated noise from traffic, vehicle doors, along with the noise from shopping trolleys rattling along, and public use for the duration of the expected long hours of opening, at least 15 hours a day seven days a week. The car park lights will be on all evening. Once the trees, hedge & house have been demolished the traffic noise from Ringwood Rd will be excessive and adversely affected by unsightly views across the proposed car park to the existing garage premises on the north side of Ringwood Road.
6. The proposal will result in the surrounding homes adversely affected by the construction of the proposed new store; it would overbear adjacent properties most of them being bungalows and fails to comply with core strategy policy HE2. Ground disturbance, vibration from construction and HGVs will damage the structural integrity of surrounding homes.
7. The proposal will result in a change of use of 78 Ringwood Road from residential (C3) to commercial/retail, which will have a resultant adverse effect on the amenity of the immediate locality, and specifically, 21 Crescent Road and other adjoining residential dwellings.
8. The proposed change of use is inconsistent with the adopted local plan and core strategy.
9. The proposal will result in a loss of a dense group of trees to the rear of the site at 78 Ringwood Road, and directly behind 21 Crescent Road, associated with the existing residential use.
10. The proposal will result in a severe change and loss of outlook from the rear of 21 Crescent Road and other homes in the immediate

locality, which currently look out onto trees and residential properties

11. The proposal will result in a significant loss in the Market Value of surrounding homes.

12. The proposal will result in surrounding homes being adversely affected by noise from the plant room on the southeast side of the proposed new store

James Mitchell, Regional Head of Property, Lidl GB

Good afternoon members, thanks for considering this statement in support of our Verwood proposals.

I am delighted our application is presented to you recommended for approval after many months of discussion with your officers. The positive recommendation reflects the complete policy compliance of our scheme.

I have provided a brochure on the application to members pre-committee which I hope has proved useful. This sets out the evolution of the application and summarises the key benefits of the scheme.

I would like to take this further opportunity to reiterate those benefits.

The proposals before you today;

- • represent economic development, providing a multi-million investment in Verwood, creating 40 new jobs and attracting a significant CIL contribution.
- • are fully policy compliant with the retail policy aspects audited and approved by the Council's external professional advisor.
- • reduce the need for residents to travel outside of Verwood for their basic shopping needs, stemming the very significant outflow of expenditure to Ringwood and Ferndown and so making Verwood a more sustainable retail location.
- • provide much needed choice and competition to the benefit of the consumer without adversely affecting the vitality and viability of Verwood town centre.
- • represent highly sustainable development including the provision of solar photo voltaic cells.
- • offer a net gain in biodiversity on site.
- • retain the protected oak tree and provide a significant net gain in high quality landscaping infrastructure including the planting of 15 new trees.
- • offer a high-quality design which responds sensitively to the environment in terms of materials palette, level and scale thus protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Last but certainly not least is the need to highlight the public support for this scheme.

Lidl conducted their own extensive consultation writing to over 10,000 households and local businesses informing them of our proposals and asking for their opinion. There was an unprecedented level of response with 3648 people taking the time to give their view. Of these a very large majority support the proposals (87%). This is indicative of the dissatisfaction with the current retail choice and the frustration of needing to go outside of Verwood to fulfil their shopping needs.

The situation on the Council's consultation is similarly positive with 82% of respondents supporting the scheme from over 400 direct comments. In these challenging times there has never been a greater need for high quality, great value local shopping facilities to be provided. Job creating schemes that benefit local economies and communities should be supported.

Our scheme is such a scheme and carries a recommendation to approve based on complete policy compliance.
I therefore hope very much that members will support their officer's recommendation and grant planning permission this afternoon.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 4.00 pm

Chairman

.....