

Public Document Pack



NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 8 FEBRUARY 2022

Present: Cllrs Sherry Jespersen (Chairman), Mary Penfold (Vice-Chairman), Tim Cook, Matthew Hall, Brian Heatley, Carole Jones, Stella Jones, Val Potheary and Belinda Ridout

Apologies: Cllrs Jon Andrews, Les Fry and Emma Parker

Also present: Cllr Piers Brown and Cllr David Walsh

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

Hannah Smith (Planning Area Manager), Robert Lennis (Area Lead (Major Projects) Eastern), Hannah Massey (Lawyer - Regulatory), Mike Garrity (Head of Planning), Steve Savage (Transport Development Manager), Emily Jones (Senior Planning Officer), Verity Murphy (Senior Planning Officer), Simon Sharp (Senior Planning Officer), Megan Rochester (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice) and George Dare (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

54. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Les Fry, Jon Andrews, and Emma Parker. Councillor Stella Jones gave her apologies for the afternoon session.

55. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of disclosable interests were made at the meeting.

56. 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.

57. Planning Applications

The Committee considered the applications below for planning permission.

58. P/OUT/2021/04019, Common Mead Lane, Gillingham, Dorset

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application for the erection of up to 80 No. dwellings, form vehicular access, associated open space and infrastructure.

Committee members were shown the location of the site which is next to a care home and various photographs of the site. The officer's presentation included details on the access to the site as well as details of the enhanced community infrastructure. Members were also informed of an increase in affordable housing. The Senior Planning Officer referred to policies 2, 20 and the neighbourhood plan. The recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement and conditions.

The Transport Development Manager outlined the access to the site. The access would include visibility splays with sufficient intervisibility between the access and the care home. There would be a footway connection from the new access to the existing footway with direct links to the town centre. There would be low traffic movement which would not affect safety.

The Technical Support Officer read the representations which are attached as an annexure to these minutes.

Members' Questions and Comments

Members asked questions and made comments relating to the following:

- The enforcement of compensatory habitats and wildlife corridors in the southern section, secured through the section 106 agreement.
- Inclusion of informal or permissive footpaths allowing people to walk across the site.
- Benefits to the community, which included 25% affordable housing
- Mitigation for biodiversity on the site. Members asked for particular attention to be given to serotine bats.
- Clarification on the northern field being transferred to the town council and if there would be a sum of money with it.
- Including a requirement for a contribution, as part of the Section 106 agreement, towards the maintenance for the large area of open space transferred to the town council.
- The 5-year Housing land supply. The Housing delivery test below the required amount.

Proposed by Cllr Carole Jones, seconded by Cllr Brian Heatley.

The Committee were 'minded to' grant the application, subject to conditions and negotiation additional heads of terms in the Section 106.

The Head of Planning having considered the representations and the officer's presentation and having taken into account the views of the committee, made the following decision under delegated authority: that the application be granted, subject to conditions and the negotiation of additional Section 106 heads of terms.

Decision: That the application be granted, subject to the conditions and the negotiation of additional Section 106 heads of terms.

59. **P/RES/2021/01690, Higher Blandford Road, Cann, Dorset**

The Area Lead Planning Officer introduced the application to erect 55 No. dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure. (Reserved Matters application to determine appearance, landscaping, layout & scale, following the grant of Outline Planning Permission No. APP/N1215/W/19/3227559 (LPA Ref. 2/2018/0602/OUT).

The context of the site was described: employment allocation to the east, no conservation areas, and a listed building to the southwest but would not be affected.

The Case Officer presented to members. They were shown the layout of the site which included 17 affordable housing and various photographs. Members were shown elevations of the dwellings and street scenes, which showed the proposed appearances of the buildings as well as planting details including street trees. There would be feature buildings with green sandstone. Members were informed that each house would have some form of electric car charging infrastructure. The Case Officer informed members that the site was near a listed building, but it would not be impacted. The committee was also informed that infrastructure to allow solar panels would be installed, as a matter of conditional approval, to allow residents to install solar panels. The recommendation was to grant planning permission.

The Transport Development Manager outlined the access to the site and confirmed that changes would be made to the junction of the A30 with the B3081 to make it safer. The site access was approved in the outline application, which included details of the position of the junction and the associated off-site highway works. In addition, there would be an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing provided for residents to have a safe crossing point across the B3081.

The Technical Support Officer read the representations which are attached as an annexure to these minutes.

Members' Questions and Comments

Members asked questions and made comments relating to the following:

- Lighting for the development
- The site being near to an AONB but not within it
- Referred to condition 5 about extending the maintenance of trees and making it more robust.
- Solar infrastructure for a diverse market
- Members were pleased that this site would be making a nod to green energy with the infrastructure.
- Sufficiency of solar panels for the positioning of the houses.
- 30% affordable housing

Proposed by Cllr Val Potheary, seconded by Cllr Carole Jones with the extra landscaping condition of extending the maintenance of trees.

The Committee were 'minded to' grant the application, subject to conditions.

The Head of Planning having considered the representations and the officer's presentation and having taken into account the views of the committee, made the following decision under delegated authority: that the application be granted, subject to conditions and an extended landscaping condition.

Decision: That the application be granted, subject to the conditions.

60. **P/FUL/2021/02870 - Land south of Newlands Manor House, Charlton Marshall**

The Area Lead Planning Officer introduced the application to erect 40 No. dwellings with associated parking and access. Reserved Matters application to determine appearance, landscaping, layout, scale, and access, following the grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2017/1716/OUT.

The Committee were shown the location of the site and various plans. It was noted that the original application proposed 50 dwellings on the site it was conditioned to limit the number to 40no. dwellings. Hence, proposal was for 40 dwellings with 40% affordable housing. Members' attention was drawn to the elevations of street scenes and the proposed landscaping, which showed the appearance of the site. The Case Officer also informed members of footpaths, linking the development into existing developments without impacts to privacy. The recommendation was to grant planning permission.

The Transport Development Manager outlined the access to the site and details of the visibility splays. There were sufficient footways, but uncontrolled pedestrian crossings needed to be agreed. Members were informed of a speed table being included to keep speeds low. In addition to this, an analysis had been completed to ensure there was enough space for refuse vehicles to access the development. Visitor parking in addition to private parking spaces was also included.

The Technical Support Officer read the representations which are attached as an annexure to these minutes.

Members' Questions and Comments

Members asked questions and made comments relating to the following:

- Conditioning a button-controlled crossing
- Car recharge points for dwellings
- 40% affordable housing
- Members praised the designs of the development.

Proposed by Cllr Belinda Ridout, seconded by Cllr Carole Jones.

The Committee were 'minded to' grant the application, subject to conditions

The Head of Planning having considered the representations and the officer's presentation and having taken into account the views of the committee, made the following decision under delegated authority: that the application be granted, subject to conditions.

Decision: That the application be granted, subject to the conditions.

Cllr Stella Jones left the meeting.

At 12.45 the Committee adjourned for lunch until 14.00. Upon reconvening a vote was taken to extend the meeting as the duration was longer than 3 hours. Proposed by Cllr Penfold, seconded by Cllr Potheary. The vote was carried.

61. **3/20/1328/FUL, Frogmore Lane, Sixpenny Handley**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application for a residential development comprising 7 new dwellings with ancillary car parking. (As amended 25/02/21 by Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Strategy and revisions to Plot 1).

The Case Officer presented to members. Members were shown the location of the site and various photographs. They were shown the site plans and proposed building materials. The committee was informed that the surrounding land of the site was prone to flooding so the dwellings had been arranged to avoid this. Members were also informed of the arrangements put in place to prevent flooding. The recommendation was to grant planning permission.

The Transport Development Manager outlined the access to the site. Visibility splays would be created by removing part of a hedgerow. There would be space for parking on the site. There would be low traffic movement which would not have an impact on safety. Members were also informed of maintenance being the responsibility of the developer or by a private contractor.

Cllr Piers Brown, the Ward Member, raised his concerns regarding the development. This was because of there being no affordable housing as well as residents having to pay for the costs of maintenance. In addition to this, he was concerned about the lack of car parking and the impacts of flooding on neighbouring fields. He described the site as not fit for purpose.

The Technical Support Officer read the representations which are attached as an annexure to these minutes.

Members' Questions and Comments

Members asked questions and made comments relating to the application. In response, officers confirmed:

- Refuse collection was acceptable in the visibility splays
- There was an assessment of flooding in all areas to prevent other potential risks of flooding
- There were contingency plans to ensure attenuation tanks were fit for purpose and could hold sufficient capacity of water if there was an increase in flooding from climate change
- How the attenuation tanks would release the flood water
- There was a decrease in number of dwellings from previous applications on the site, to avoid flooding
- There were passing places on lanes by the site, however a weight limit for vehicles on those lanes would be difficult to enforce.

Proposed by Cllr Mary Penfold, seconded by Cllr Tim Cook

The Committee were 'minded to' grant the application, subject to conditions

The Head of Planning having considered the representations and the officer's presentation and having taken into account the views of the committee, made the following decision under delegated authority: that the application be granted, subject to conditions.

Decision: That the application be granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the appendix attached to these minutes.

62. P/FUL/2021/02897 - Land adj 362 Bournemouth Rd, Charlton Marshall

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application to members. They were shown the location of the site for the development of 6 No. dwellings, as well as various photographs of the site. Members' attention was drawn to elevations of the proposed development and proposed site plan, which included a footway to the site from the adjacent trailway. The development would be accessed within the 30mph zone of Bournemouth Road. The recommendation was to grant planning permission.

The Transport Development Manager outlined the access to the site which was improved in 2019. These improvements included better visibility splays and provided an internal turning area. Members were informed that maintenance and refuse collection would be the responsibility of developers or residents. Members were assured that although traffic flow in the area was high, visibility was acceptable. The Highway Authority would only be supportive of this application if there was a condition to close the southern access to the site because this access was sub-standard.

The Technical Support Officer read the representations which are attached as an annexure to these minutes.

Members' Questions and Comments

Members asked questions and made comments relating to the following:

- Members raised concerns regarding emergency vehicles having space to access the development. They were assured that there would be space for these vehicles, but the fire services would need to provide a smaller vehicle if needed.
- An overdevelopment of the site and building sizes in an unsuitable location, outside the settlement boundary.
- The trailway no longer being as easily assessable
- Problems with the proposed site layout and gradient of the access to the site
- Concerns regarding residents having to pay for services, such as waste collection that other people get for free.
- Members also expressed their concerns regarding wheelchair users crossing the road and accessing the site.
- The sufficiency of the visibility at the site access.
- Vehicles passing each other on the site
- Conditioning a non-slip surface for the steep gradient and to retain throughout the lifetime of the development.

At 16:14 the meeting was adjourned until 16:36. Upon reconvening there was a vote taken to refuse the application.

Proposed by Cllr Carole Jones, seconded by Cllr Belinda Ridout.

The Committee were 'minded to' refuse the application.

The Head of Planning having considered the representations and the officer's presentation and having taken into account the views of the committee, made the following decision under delegated authority: that the application be refused.

Decision: That the application be refused.

Reasons for refusal:

The proposed development is located outside of the defined settlement boundary and, as such, would be contrary to Policies 2 and 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2016), which provide that development should only be permitted where there is an overriding need for it to be located in the countryside. The proposed layout has not been designed to promote accessibility, and would fail to provide an inclusive design, due to the excessive gradient of the site, which would exceed the gradient contained within the guidance on inclusive mobility. The layout would therefore fail to pay sufficient regard to all users, and specifically those with protected characteristics. The proposal has paid insufficient regard to the statutory equalities duty and the needs of the mobility or sensory impaired. It would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Guidance with particular regard to paragraphs 110 and 112 and, in combination with its location outside of the settlement boundary, would result in adverse impacts to an extent that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development.

63. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

64. Exempt Business

There was no exempt business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 4.45 pm

Chairman

.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee – Update Sheet

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
P/OUT/2021/04019	Land north of Common Mead Lane Gillingham, Dorset	5	7-42
<p>Officers recommend that the following additional conditions are added to the consent if Committee are minded to grant the application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No development shall take place, including demolition, ground works and vegetation clearance, until a Great Crested Newt Strategy has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The content of the Strategy shall include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Habitats currently present - Impacts from development without mitigation -Mitigation -Capture/Exclusion -Compensation/Habitat creation measures - Management of habitats within the development -Implementation and monitoring <p>The GCN strategy will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To secure mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain for impacts on biodiversity</p> 2. Prior to the commencement of development, a barn owl mitigation and compensation strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. <p>Reason: To minimise impacts on biodiversity.</p> 			
Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
P/RES/2021/01690	Higher Blandford Road, Cann, Dorset	6	43 - 68
<p>Officers recommend that the following additional landscaping condition is added to the consent if Committee are minded to grant the application:</p>			

1. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, full details of the planting within and around the Suds pond (including any boundary treatment thereto) shall submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with approved details in the first planting season following the first occupation and/or use of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting any trees, shrubs, or other plants should die or are removed or become seriously damaged or defective in the opinion of the local planning authority, then the applicant or their successors in title shall replace said tree, shrub, or plant with another of the same species and size as originally planted and in the same approximate location in the next planting season, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation considered to be reasonable and necessary.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
P/FUL/2021/02897	Land adjacent 362 Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshal	9	93 - 114

Officers recommend that the following additional condition, as recommended by the Highway Authority, is added to the consent if Committee are minded to grant the application:

1. Before the development is occupied or utilised the existing southern access point onto the A350 must be permanently closed by extending the adjoining highway boundary and removing any gates. The existing highway vehicular crossing must be expunged and reinstated to a specification which must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

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

Northern Area Planning Committee

8 February 2022

Decisions List

APPLICATION NUMBER: P/OUT/2021/04019

APPLICATION SITE: Land North of Common Mead Lane, Gillingham, Dorset

PROPOSAL: Develop land by the erection of up to 80 No. dwellings, form vehicular access, associated open space and infrastructure. (Outline application to determine access).

DECISION:

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:

- 25% affordable housing
- Local Area of Play
- Local Equipped Area of Play
- Destination Play Facilities Maintenance
- Formal Outdoor Sports
- Formal Outdoor Sports Maintenance
- Informal Outdoor Space
- Informal Outdoor Space Maintenance
- Community, Leisure & Indoor Sport Facilities
- Primary School contribution
- Secondary School contribution
- Pre School contribution
- Bus Service contribution
- Bus stop contribution
- Community transport contribution
- Rights of way enhancements
- Health
- Libraries
- Waste
- Drainage (SUDS)
- 4.3ha of land for biodiversity net gain
- The northern field (8.05ha) to be offered to and transferred (if accepted) to Gillingham Town Council
- £65,467.20 towards compensatory habitat

And the conditions (and their reasons).

B) **REFUSE** permission for failing to secure the obligations above if the agreement is not completed by (8th August 2022) or such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning.

CONDITIONS:

1. Approval of the details of the layout, scale or appearance of the building(s), the means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter “the Reserved Matters”) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced. Such development shall be carried out as approved.

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

2. Application for the approval of the Reserved Matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this outline permission.

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

3. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of final approval of the Reserved Matters or, in the case of approval on different dated, the final approval of the last Reserved Matter to be approved.

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

Approved Plans

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

- Location Plan, drawing ref – 2040/PL.01 Rev B
- Access design and visibility splays, drawing ref – 020.0572.001

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

Quantum of Development

5. The development hereby approved shall be limited to a maximum of 80 dwellings only.

Reason: To define the extent of the permission

Trees/Landscaping

6. No dwelling hereby approved shall be first occupied or used until details of the onsite public open space has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submission must include details relating to the design, laying out and future arrangements for management and maintenance of the open space. The open space shall then be implemented and maintained as approved for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the landscape scheme secured by reserved matters is implemented and satisfactorily maintained in the interests of the character and amenity of the completed development.

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

- a) a specification for protective fencing to trees and hedges during both demolition and construction phases which complies with BS5837 (2012) and a plan indicating the alignment of the protective fencing;
- b) a specification for scaffolding of building works and ground protection within the tree protection zones in accordance with BS5837 (2012);
- c) a schedule of tree work conforming to BS3998;
- d) details of the area for storage of materials, concrete mixing and any bonfires;
- e) plans and particulars showing proposed cables, pipes and ducts above and below ground as well as the location of any soakaway or water or sewerage storage facility;
- f) details of any no-dig specification for all works within the root protection area for retained trees;
- g) details of the supervision to be carried out by the developers tree specialist.

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

8. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the first occupation and/or use of the development and any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of that phase of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

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

9. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, a landscape management plan shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens. The development's landscaping shall be managed in accordance with the approved plan for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the landscape scheme secured by reserved matters is implemented and satisfactorily maintained in the interests of the character and amenity of the completed development.

Drainage

10. Prior to the commencement of the development 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, 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 before the development is completed and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

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

11. Prior to the commencement of the development details of maintenance and management of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in

writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These 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.

Heritage

12. Prior to the commencement of any development the applicant, their agent or successors in title shall secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall cover archaeological fieldwork together with post-excavation work and publication of the results.

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

Ecology

13. A landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to the commencement of any development which requires approval under the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol. The content of the LEMP shall include the following:

- a) submission of an updated Ecological Impact Assessment report to include: habitat losses and gains assessment and demonstration of measurable biodiversity net gain; European Protected Species Mitigation Licence as required for Great crested newts or a Compensation Payment Certificate issued under the Dorset Council GCN Licence scheme
- b) Description, evaluation and conservation objectives of features to be managed.
- c) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- d) Detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) & management prescriptions to achieve stated objectives.
- e) Extent and location/area of proposed works on appropriate scale maps and plans.
- f) Type and source of materials to be used where appropriate, e.g. native species of local provenance.
- g) Timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development.
- h) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
- i) Persons responsible for implementing the works.
- j) Details of the body or organization responsible for the long-term implementation of the plan.
- k) Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance.
- l) Details for monitoring and remedial measures.
- m) Details for disposal of any wastes arising from works.
- n) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims 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 biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

The approved LEMP must be implemented 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.

Lighting

14. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, an external lighting strategy shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The agreed strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure that lighting is installed and maintained in a manner which will minimise possible light pollution to the night sky, neighbouring properties and protected species.

Highways/Transport/Construction

15. Prior to the commencement of any development the first 15 metres of the vehicle access, measured from the nearside edge of the carriageway, shall be laid out and constructed to a specification first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of accidents

16. Prior to the occupation of the development the visibility splay areas as shown on drawing ref – 020.0572.001 must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.60 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. The splay areas must thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstructions at all times.

Reason: To reduce the risk of accidents

17. The development hereby permitted must not be occupied or utilised until a scheme showing precise details of the proposed cycle parking facilities is submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details, maintained and kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.

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

18. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of a scheme to install infrastructure, to facilitate charging for plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles within the development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include a timetable for implementation.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details as have been approved by the Local Planning Authority including the timetable for implementation.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made to enable charging of plug-in and ultra-low emission vehicles

19. Prior to the occupation of the development, a Travel Plan must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The Travel Plan, as submitted, will include:

- a) Targets for sustainable travel arrangements.
- b) Effective measures for the on-going monitoring of the Travel Plan.
- c) A commitment to delivering the Travel Plan objectives for a period of at least five years from first occupation of the development.
- d) Effective mechanisms to achieve the objectives of the Travel Plan by the occupiers of the development

The development must be implemented only in accordance with the approved Travel Plan.

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.

Construction

20. Prior to the commencement of development, 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
- 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.

Contamination

21. Prior to the commencement of the development, a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This strategy must include the following components:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - all previous uses;
 - potential contaminants associated with those uses;
 - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and
 - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site

2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority.

The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of pollution.

22. Prior to occupation of the development a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved (contamination) remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

Reason: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to human health by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete.

23. If during development contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out on that phase (or a parcel or parcels therein) until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination not previously identified will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, this remediation strategy shall be implemented as agreed in writing.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources.

Broadband

24. Prior to the commencement of any development a scheme for facilitating infrastructure to support superfast broadband technology to serve the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall include a timetable for implementation, including triggers for a phased implementation if appropriate. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the utilities service infrastructure is sufficient to meet the extra demands imposed by this development.

Conditions from the Update Sheet

25. No development shall take place, including demolition, ground works and vegetation clearance, until a Great Crested Newt Strategy has been submitted to, and approved in

writing by, the local planning authority. The content of the Strategy shall include the following:

- Habitats currently present
- Impacts from development without mitigation
- Mitigation
- Capture/Exclusion
- Compensation/Habitat creation measures
- Management of habitats within the development
- Implementation and monitoring

The GCN strategy will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain for impacts on biodiversity.

26. Prior to the commencement of development, a barn owl mitigation and compensation strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To minimise impacts on biodiversity.

APPLICATION NUMBER: P/RES/2021/01690

APPLICATION SITE: Land at E 387470 N 122346, Higher Blandford Road, Cann, Dorset

PROPOSAL: Erect 55 No. dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure. (Reserved Matters application to determine appearance, landscaping, layout & scale; following the grant of Outline Planning Permission No. APP/N1215/W/19/3227559 (LPA Ref. 2/2018/0602/OUT)).

DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions.

CONDITIONS:

1. The development to which these reserved matters and accompanying details relates shall be begun not later than two years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 92(2) 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:

Site Plans -

140-LOC01_Location Plan
140-LP02f_Storey Heights Plan
140-LP03f_Boundary Treatment & Materials Plan
140-LP04f_Coloured Site Layout & Hard Landscaping Plan
140-LP05f_Refuse Strategy Plan
140-LP06f_POS & Managed Areas Plan
140-LP07c_Pedestrian & Cycle Links
140-LP08c_Renewables & Car Charging Plan

Landscaping

PERSC23145 11 D-Sheet 1
PERSC23145 11 D-Sheet 2
PERSC23145 11 D-Sheet 3
PERSC23145 11 D-Sheet 4
PERSC23145 11 D-Sheet 5
PERSC23145 Landscape Man and Maintenance A
PERSC23145 Landscape Specification A

Engineering

H1235-401A
H1235-402A
H1235-403A
H1235-404A
H1235-405A
H1235-406A
H1235-414A
H1235-415A
H1235-416A
H1235-422A
H1235-431A

Housetypes

BS-001 - Bin & Cycle Stores
 CW-001 - Charnwood Plot 51 A
 CW-C-002 - Charnwood Corner (Type 2) Plots 15 45 A
 GAR-001- Single Garage A
 GAR-002 - Double & Twin Garage A
 GAR-003 - Triple Garage
 GZ-001 - Grizedale (Semi) Plots 32 33 C
 GZ-002 - Grizedale (Terrace) A Plot 23-25
 HF-CN-001 - 1B & 2B Flats B
 HF-CN-002 - 1B & 2B Flats B
 HL-001 - Haldon B Plots 38-39 C
 KB-001 - Knightsbridge (Type 1) Plot 29 C
 KB-002 - Knightsbridge (Type 2) Plot 28 A
 KB-003 - Knightsbridge (Type 3) Plots 03 04 B
 KB-004 - Knightsbridge (Type 4) Plot 26 A
 KL-001 - Kielder (Type 1) Plots 01 09 12 55 C
 KL-002 - Kielder (Type 2) Plot 50 A
 KL-004 - Kielder (Type 4) Plot 43 49 B
 KL-005 - Kielder (Type 5) Plots 44 48 A
 KL-006 - Kielder (Type 6) Plots 06 07 36 37 A
 MY-001 - Mayfair (Type 1) Plot 42 B
 MY-001 - Mayfair Corner (Type 2) Plot 22 A
 MY-002 - Mayfair (Type 2) Plot 27 A
 MY-003 - Mayfair (Type 3) Plot 52 B
 MY-004 - Mayfair (Type 4) Plot 46 A
 MY-C-001 - Mayfair Corner (Bay) Type 1 Plots 02 10 54 A
 MY-C-002 - Mayfair Corner plot 47 A
 MY-C-004 - Mayfair Corner (Type 4) Plot 53
 RN-001 - Rendlesham (Type 1) Plots 30 31 40 41 C
 RN-002 - Rendlesham (Type 2) plot 20 21 B
 RN-002 - Rendlesham (Type3) plot 34 35 D
 WL-C-001 - Whiteleaf Corner (Type 1) Plots 08 13 14 B
 WL-C-002 - Whiteleaf Corner (Type 2) Plot 05 A

3. Notwithstanding the details on any of the approved plans, and prior to commencement of the development hereby approved above damp-proof course level, details and samples of all external facing materials (including, walls, roofs, fenestration detail and man-made boundary features) shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as agreed.

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

4. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied or utilised until a programme and timetable for the provision of the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shown on drawing Number 140-LP05f have been submitted to and agreed, in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed programme and timetable. The completed turning and parking areas shall be kept free from obstruction and made available as set out in the agreed programme and timetable for the purposes specified.

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

5. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out and managed in accordance with the Landscape Plans and Documents listed in condition 2. Hard landscaping works associated with each dwelling shall be completed prior to the occupation and/or use of that dwelling. The soft landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting season following the first occupation and/or use of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting any trees, shrubs, or other plants should die or are removed or become seriously damaged or defective in the opinion of the local planning authority, then the applicant or their successors in title shall replace said tree, shrub, or plant with another of the same species and size as originally planted and in the same approximate location in the next planting season, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation considered to be reasonable and necessary.

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

6. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, and prior to the first occupation of and/or use any dwelling hereby approved, details of the noise mitigation strategies summarised in section 14.4 and detailed in chapters 9 and 10 of submitted Environmental Noise Impact (acoustic report) SA - 6777 - 3 shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure noise levels are not detrimental to the enjoyment of these dwellings as per NPPF paragraph 180.

7. Prior to commencement of development an earthworks management plan for the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should include details of re-use of excavated soil on-site, a soil sampling procedure, verification requirements and reporting of findings including any unexpected contaminated soil and location. Thereafter the development shall be carried-out in accordance with the agreed MMP.

Reason: in the interest of health and safety.

8. Prior to the first occupation and or use of any dwelling hereby approved, full details of the Electrical Vehicle Charging points, as shown on plan 140-LP08c_Renewables & Car Charging Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include samples, location and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the buildings. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval and shall be retained at all times, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Charging Points shall be installed prior to the occupation of each individual dwelling.

Reason: to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by ensuring that adequate provision is made to enable occupiers of the development to charge plug-in and ultra-low emission vehicles in accordance with Policy 3 of the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1.

9. Prior to the first occupation and or use of any dwelling hereby approved, full details of the Solar PV infrastructure, as shown on plan 140-LP08c_Renewables & Car Charging Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include samples, location and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the buildings. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval and shall be retained at all times, unless otherwise agreed in

writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Solar PV infrastructure shall be installed prior to the occupation of each individual dwelling.

Reason: to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by ensuring that adequate provision is made to enable occupiers of the development to install alternative methods of generating electricity in accordance with Policy 3 of the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1.

10. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, full details of the planting within and around the Suds pond (including any boundary treatment thereto) shall submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with approved details in the first planting season following the first occupation and/or use of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting any trees, shrubs, or other plants should die or are removed or become seriously damaged or defective in the opinion of the local planning authority, then the applicant or their successors in title shall replace said tree, shrub, or plant with another of the same species and size as originally planted and in the same approximate location in the next planting season, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation considered to be reasonable and necessary.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development

APPLICATION NUMBER: P/RES/2021/02870

APPLICATION SITE: Land South of Newlands Manor House, Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall, Dorset

PROPOSAL: Erect 40 No. dwellings with associated parking and access. Reserved Matters application to determine appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access, following the grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2017/1716/OUT.

DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions

CONDITIONS:

1. The development to which these reserved matters and accompanying details relates shall be begun not later than two years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 92(2) 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:

- PD-01-E Elevations Plot 1-2
- PD-01-P Floor Plans Plot 1-2
- PD-02-E Elevations Plot 3-4
- PD-02-P Floor Plans Plot 3-4
- PD-03-E Elevations Plot 5
- PD-03-P Floor Plans Plot 5
- PD-04-E Elevations Plot 6
- PD-04-P Floor Plans Plot 6
- PD-05-E Elevations Plots 7-8
- PD-05-P Floor Plans Plots 7-8
- PD-06-E Elevations Plots 9-11
- PD-06-P Floor Plans Plot 9-11
- PD-07-E Elevations Plot 12
- PD-07-P Floor Plans Plot 12
- PD-16-E Elevations Plot 13 Rev B
- PD-16-P Floor Plans Plot 13 Rev B
- PD-09-E Elevations Plot 14
- PD-09-P Floor Plans Plot 14
- PD-10-E Elevations Plot 15-19 RevB
- PD-10-P Floor Plans Plot 15-19 Rev B
- PD-11-E Elevations Plot 20
- PD-11-P Floor Plans Plot 20
- PD-12-E Elevations Plot 21
- PD-12-P Floor Plans Plot 21
- PD-13-E Elevations Plot 22
- PD-13-P Floor Plans Plot 22
- PD-14-E Elevations Plot 23-24
- PD-14-P Floor Plans Plot 23-24
- PD-15-E Elevations Plot 25
- PD-15-P Floor Plans Plot 25

- PD-16-E Elevations Plot 26
- PD-16-P Floor Plans Plot 26
- PD-17-E Elevations Plot 27
- PD-17-P Floor Plans Plot 27
- PD-01-E Elevations Plot 28-29
- PD-01-P Floor Plans Plot 28-29
- PD-19-E Elevations Plot 30-31
- PD-19-P Floor Plans Plot 30-31
- PD-20-E Elevations Plot 32
- PD-20-P Floor Plans Plot 32
- PD-21-E Elevations Plot 33 Rev B
- PD-21-P Floor Plans Plot 33 Rev B
- PD-22-E Elevations Plot 34-35
- PD-22-P Floor Plans Plot 34-35
- PD-23-E Elevations Plot 36-37
- PD-23-P Floor Plans Plot 36-37
- PD-24-E Elevations Plot 38-39
- PD-24-P Floor Plans Plot 38-39
- PD-25-E Elevations Plot 40
- PD-25-P Floor Plans Plot 40

- 2529-MBL-XX-00-DR-D-0002_P3 Traffic calming
- 2529-MBL-XX-00-DR-D-0004_P3 Engineering layout
- 2529-MBL-XX-00-DR-D-0007_P3 SUDs features
- 2529-MBL-XX-00-DR-D-0009_P1 Vehicle tracking
- 2529-MBL-XX-00-DR-D-0010_P1 Vehicle tracking

- Access junction layout AIS076-01-01-01
- Landscape Layout 676/01 P5
- Planting Strategy 676/02 P4
- LO/P/01 - Location Plan
- Site Layout L/P/01A

3. Notwithstanding the details on any of the approved plans, and prior to commencement of the development hereby approved above damp-proof course level, details and samples of all external facing materials (including, walls, chimneys, roofs, and fenestration detail, and any man-made boundary features) shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as agreed.

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

4. Prior to completion of damp proof course of any dwelling a hard and soft landscape scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing details of all trees and other planting to be retained; a planting specification to include numbers, size, species and positions of all new trees and shrubs, details of existing and proposed levels, walls, fences and other boundary treatment and surface treatment of the open parts of the site together with any lighting, street furniture and underground services and a programme of implementation. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: to ensure that adequate mitigation for the landscape and visual impact of the proposals and the provision of an appropriate and viable hard and soft landscape scheme.

6. Prior to completion of damp proof course of any dwelling a Landscape Management Plan (LMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The LMP shall include details of how the hard and soft landscaped parts of the scheme are to be managed in the long term. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: to ensure that arrangements for the long-term management and maintenance of the agreed hard and soft landscaping scheme.

7. Any trees or other plants indicated in the agreed details of condition 5 above which, within a period of five years from the date of the development being completed should die, or are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced during the next planting season with other trees or plants of a species and size to be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to ensure that the agreed hard and soft landscaping scheme is established and maintained.

8. Prior to the first occupation and or use of any dwelling hereby approved, full details of the Electrical Vehicle Charging points shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include samples, location and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the buildings. Thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by ensuring that adequate provision is made to enable occupiers of the development to charge plug-in and ultra-low emission vehicles in accordance with Policy 3 of the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1.

9. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved details of the externally lighting of the site; in particular, details relating to street line and times of illumination shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: to protect the character of the area and reduce the amount of illumination in the night time sky.

APPLICATION NUMBER: 3/20/1328/FUL

APPLICATION SITE: Frogmore Lane, Sixpenny Handley, Salisbury, DP5 5NY

PROPOSAL: Residential development comprising 7 new dwellings with ancillary car parking. (As amended 25/02/21 by Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Strategy and revisions to Plot 1).

DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions

CONDITIONS:

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

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

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

Location Plan, Topographical Survey - drawing no. 17199.35 - dated 30 July 2020

Site/Block Plan - drawing no. 17199.36 Rev A - dated 22 December 2020

House 1 Plans and Elevations - drawing no. 17199.37 Rev A - dated 22 December 2020

House 2 Plans and Elevations - drawing no. 17199.38 Rev B - dated 22 December 2020

House 3-4 Plans and Elevations - drawing no. 17199.39 Rev A - dated 18 August 2020

House 5-6 Plans and Elevations - drawing no. 17199.40 Rev A - dated 18 August 2020

House 7 Plans and Elevations - drawing no. 17199.41 Rev A - dated 18 August 2020

Street Elevation and Illustrative View - drawing no. 17199.42 Rev A - dated 22 December 2020

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

3. There shall be no surface water connections into the foul sewer network.

Reason: To prevent the increase of the risk of sewer flooding and pollution.

4. 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, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is completed.

Reason: A pre-commencement condition is required to prevent the increased risk of flooding and to protect water quality.

5. No development shall take place until details of maintenance and management of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and

thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These should include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: This condition is required to ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

6. Before the development is occupied or utilised the first 10.00 metres of the vehicle access, measured from the rear edge of the highway (excluding the vehicle crossing - see the Informative Note below), must be laid out and constructed to a specification submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that a suitably surfaced and constructed access to the site is provided that prevents loose material being dragged and/or deposited onto the adjacent carriageway causing a safety hazard.

7. Before the development is occupied or utilised the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shown on Drawing Number 17199.36 must be constructed, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority. 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.

8. Before the development is occupied or utilised the cycle parking facilities shown on Drawing Number 17199.36 must have been constructed. Thereafter, these must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

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

9. There must be no gates hung so as to form obstruction to the vehicular access serving the site.

Reason: To ensure the free and easy movement of vehicles through the access and to prevent any likely interruption to the free flow of traffic on the adjacent public highway.

10. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised the visibility splay areas as shown on Drawing Number 17199.36 must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.60 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. The splay areas must thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstructions.

Reason: To ensure that a vehicle can see or be seen when exiting the access.

11. The detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain strategy set out within the approved Biodiversity Plan certified by the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team on 5 November 2021 must be implemented in accordance with any specified timetable and completed in full prior to the substantial completion, or the first bringing into use of the development hereby approved, whichever is the sooner. The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance

with the approved details. Thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain measures shall be permanently maintained and retained.

Reason: To mitigate, compensate and enhance/provide net gain for impacts on biodiversity.

12. Prior to development above damp proof course level, details and samples of all external facing materials for the wall(s) and roof(s) (including a sample panel of the flint) 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.

APPLICATION NUMBER: P/FUL/2021/02897

APPLICATION SITE: Land adjacent 362 Bournemouth Road Charlton Marshall DT11 9NL

PROPOSAL: Erect 6 No. dwellings, create new vehicular access.

DECISION: REFUSED

Reason for Refusal:

The proposed development is located outside of the defined settlement boundary and, as such, would be contrary to Policies 2 and 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2016), which provide that development should only be permitted where there is an overriding need for it to be located in the countryside. The proposed layout has not been designed to promote accessibility, and would fail to provide an inclusive design, due to the excessive gradient of the site, which would exceed the gradient contained within the guidance on inclusive mobility. The layout would therefore fail to pay sufficient regard to all users, and specifically those with protected characteristics. The proposal has paid insufficient regard to the statutory equalities duty and the needs of the mobility or sensory impaired. It would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Guidance with particular regard to paragraphs 110 and 112 and, in combination with its location outside of the settlement boundary, would result in adverse impacts to an extent that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development.

This page is intentionally left blank

Northern Area Planning Committee
Written Submissions
8 February 2022

Item 5 – P/OUT/2021/04019 – Common Mead Lane, Gillingham

Malcolm Briggs – Against the application

I object to the proposed development of land to the north of Common Mead Lane and contend this is not a proper application, which should either be an Appeal or a full submission of a proposal, rather than this attempt to deal with the reasons for previous refusal as if they were reserved matters. The developers themselves admit it is re-submission of the original proposal; in which case, it should be refused in the same way or the Council could leave itself open to a claim of abuse of process and, inevitably, calls for a Judicial Review.

The only real difference between this application and the previous one that was refused is the inclusion of an additional field which the developers say they will leave. This is not included in the original proposal or the indicative plans and therefore cannot now be considered as part of this application. The promise is neither practical nor subsequently enforceable and will lead to creeping development across the fields, until it reaches the Wyke Conservation Area.

The proposals fly in the face of very many policies in the Neighbourhood Plan which identifies this land as informal recreation or Accessible Natural Green Space.

It also is not suitable to be considered under Paragraph 11d of the Planning Framework (presumed approval for sustainable development), as it fails on all three criteria:

- 1) There is a robust Neighbourhood Plan which was only adopted by County in July 2018, and not 2010 as stated by the applicants in their Addendum; currently being reviewed
- 2) There is a 91% identified housing supply for the next 10 years
- 3) The site is not sustainable on the grounds of there being no public transport.

The reasons why this application should be refused are very similar to the 2021 Stalbridge Appeal which was also refused and this gives a clear indication on how ribbon development in a rural area should be assessed. This appeal dismissed the same stated benefits including s106 monies and increased Council Tax as being of no distinct benefit. Stalbridge has a much lower achievement of identified housing supply and yet this was not held to be a sufficient reason for suburban sprawl.

This is a much-loved, open green space which people really use – we estimate there are 50,000 visits a year to it and it has represented the western-most boundary of the township for 40 years. A development that will involve hundreds of additional vehicle movements a day has no place here and we implore the committee to reject the application again and wait for the applicants to Appeal, which we believe they would lose based on the Stalbridge Appeal.

Philip Walker – Against the application

I object to the above proposed development.

Existing planning policies: The proposed development is for a high density housing estate outside the settlement boundary, it is a greenfield site, and is subject to countryside policies where development should be strictly controlled. In addition, part of the site is situated within an area designated as an Important, Open or Wooded Area (IOWA).

Design, appearance and density of proposed development: Eighty proposed dwellings will exceed the height and massing of neighbouring buildings and doesn't respect the character and distinctiveness of the locality. It is more appropriate for a town centre suburban location. It does not provide any new green infrastructure to improve the quality of life for residents.

Traffic issues: The site is where Common Mead Lane narrows to a single track lane. The lane is in poor condition. After rain, excess water travels directly down the lane, becoming icy in winter conditions. In addition to cars, the road is used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. This road cannot take additional traffic from 80 households without substantial investment.

Infrastructure and other housing developments: There are 3 other development programmes which meet Gillingham's contribution to new housing in Dorset: Barnaby Mead, which is nearing completion, redevelopment of the old Co-op site, and the Southern Extension (1800 houses, some of which are already advertised for sale.) Unlike at the Southern Extension, Fairfax have no plan for infrastructure.

Impact on ecology and biodiversity: Fairfax's biodiversity plan recorded 6 different species of bat during activity surveys at the site, **including Serotine bats which have a vulnerable conservation status in England.** Other protected species identified were **great crested newts.** In addition, other reptiles, badgers, hedgehogs, barn owls, nesting birds are all to be found in the field area (as reported by Fairfax themselves). Plus deer have been seen. The success of the mitigation proposals and habitat creation scheme put forward by Fairfax cannot be guaranteed. The very process of creating a building site of such a size over many months will inevitably have a catastrophic impact on the local ecology.

Climate change: Dorset Council has already declared a "climate emergency". Disturbing a large grassland area will undermine the government's emissions target, as disturbance of fields releases carbon back into the atmosphere. A report in *Dorset Wildlife* magazine (Winter 2020 p13) states the following: "UK grasslands store 2 billion tonnes of carbon, but disturbance of soils release millions of tonnes each year." More information is available in a joint report by the WWF and RSPB: *The role of nature in a UK NDC (Nationally Determined Contribution).*

Sarah English – Against the application

I strongly object to the above planning application and believe it should be refused on the following grounds:

The proposed housing development is outside the defined settlement boundary of Gillingham. It is on a greenfield site and impinges on the Wyke Conservation Area. **The proposal is contrary to policies 2, 5, 20 of the adopted North Dorset Plan part 1 and paras 11, 202 and 203 of the NPPF.**

There is no **obvious over riding public benefit** to be derived from building a large housing development of 80 homes or more on this site.

The proposed Common Mead Lane site is **unsuitable** and **unsustainable** for a housing development of this kind. The only local "amenities" within the "acceptable" 400m to 1 kilometre distance from the site is a bus stop, where apparently no buses stop, and a local convenience store.

Fairfax's own Transport Assessment estimates there would be an extra **392** "trips" within a **12-hour period** to and from the housing site. If this figure is added to the number of trips currently made to and from the Mellows Care Home, according to the Transport Assessment the total would reach **501** 'trips' over a **12-hour period**.

This **extra volume of traffic** travelling daily along Common Mead Lane, and trying to turn left or right into the busy Wyke Road (B3081) would result in **increased traffic congestion, increased traffic pollution** and may well create **an accident black spot** at The Common Mead Lane/Broad Robin junction into the busy Wyke Road as all this extra daily traffic tries to turn right or left into the busy Wyke Road, (B3081) where the traffic flow is almost continual. Also, the proposed access road leading into and out of the housing development is very close to the point where Common Mead Lane becomes a narrow, windy single track land with poor visibility and relatively few passing places.

The proposed development would result in **the loss** of an informal recreational area which also provides **easy access** to open countryside and **a green space** where **out door sports** can be played and is **specifically contrary to Policies 17 and 6 of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan adopted in July 2018.**

There is **no need** for more housing developments in Gillingham. Gillingham is one of the fastest growing towns in the South West. With two other housing developments in progress, Barnaby Mead and the planned Southern extension (1800 houses), **housing quotas** in this town are already **well on target** for 2032.

Michael Cridge – Against the application

With the Southern extension now started and two BROWN field sites in Gillingham town itself with one site already under construction, this proposed development on a GREEN field site contributes nothing to the community it only detracts from the shrinking available green community space, we don't need a man made attempt at creating wildlife areas we already have natural ones, the proposed play areas, adjacent to a road, cannot replace the existing open green space for all to enjoy, this application offers nothing to the community it only detracts and should be refused.

Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan Committee – Against the application

This objection is made from the perspective of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan published in July 2018.

May we bring the Committee's attention to Policies 17, 19 and 22 of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan. This application could not be more clearly in breach of those policies. Those policies represent the wishes, desires and aspirations of the community of Gillingham. The number of objections to this application, without doubt, reinforces and illustrates those wishes, desires and aspirations.

Since the making of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan there have been applications for over 2,000 dwellings with provision for a further 200 at Station Road. There is the prospect of further windfall applications. Gillingham's housing needs are already catered for. A sufficient number and range of homes are already provided for. The removal of this land from the identified area in the Neighbourhood Plan for outdoor sport provision clearly does not support the Communities health, social or cultural wellbeing.

The provision of s106 monies cannot be considered in all cases to be an appropriate form of compensation for failing to provide for example outdoor sports provision or allotments. Land has to be made available for such matters, not developed. If there is no land available in suitable and appropriate areas then the s106 monies cannot be used to provide these facilities.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and that there are three overarching objectives:

- The economic objective will not be met as the proposal does not support growth, innovation, and improved productivity in the long term.
- The social objective will not be met as the proposal does not bring forward accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being.
- The environmental objective will not be met as the proposal does not contribute towards the protection and enhancement of our natural, built, and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently.

The application is contrary to Policy 17 of the North Dorset Local Plan as the proposal will be piecemeal and premature. It will not bring forward housing in a comprehensive and coordinated manner, as agreed through the Master Plan Framework, and will be detrimental to infrastructure delivery for Gillingham.

For the reasons mentioned the application is contrary to the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan, the North Dorset Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore the application should be rejected.

Gillingham Town Council

Gillingham Town Council recommends **refusal** of Application No. P/OUT/2021/04019 for the following reasons:

- The site is outside the settlement boundary and encroachment into the countryside would cause harm to the significance of the Wyke Conservation Area, and the non-designated Moat at Thorngrove. The harm would not be outweighed by the benefits derived from the development and is contrary to policies 2, 5, 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan (NDLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Gillingham has a deficit of 86.5 acres of amenity green space. The development would result in the loss of an existing area of informal green amenity space, and a formal area of search for new outdoor sports provision and is contrary to policies 15 of the NDLP and policies 17 and 22 of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan (GNP), and paragraph 98 and 99 NPPF.
- The application suggests that formal outdoor sports and informal outdoor space can be provided for through s106 funding. How can this be achieved when the land allocated in the neighbourhood plan for sports provision is developed for housing. There are no other suitable areas in Gillingham on which to provide much needed amenity land.
- The site is served by a sub-standard rural lane which is single carriageway width with no footways or usable highway verges. The lane is well used by the residents of Mulbury Court and the service users of Employ My Ability, many of whom use mobility scooters. Additional vehicle movements will adversely impact upon the safety of highway users; rendering the application un-sustainable. The Transport Assessment submitted by the applicant is flawed being based on estimated traffic movements using the 2011 Census which is now 11 years out of date. The vehicle movement assessment was undertaken in November 2020 whilst the UK was in lockdown and traffic movements restricted.
- There is no public transport available. Occupants will be reliant on private vehicles which is not sustainable and contrary to the NPPF.
- The development will result in the loss of amenity to the neighbouring residential care-home which is contrary to Policy 25 of the NDLP.
- At least six different species of bat were recorded during the surveys, including the vulnerable Serotine Bat. The Ecology Survey confirms the presence of great crested newts and states that the development will result in the destruction of their terrestrial habitat. This adverse effect on ecology and biodiversity cannot be mitigated against.
- The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The proposed development does not meet the objectives of the NPPF and the harm caused by the application significantly outweighs the benefits.

Nicole Stacey, PCL Planning – Agent

On behalf of the applicants, I endorse your officer's recommendation for approval of this outline application.

The application is a resubmission of the earlier application discussed at committee in August last year.

This application has sought to address the matters raised by members, which ultimately formed the reasons for refusal of the earlier application.

The Council's Conservation Officer agrees with the applicant's Heritage Impact Assessment, and considers that the impact of the proposals to nearby heritage assets equate to "*less than substantial harm*" and the public benefits of the scheme substantially outweigh any harm.

With regards to loss of open space, the site is privately owned. Whilst there are existing public rights of way through the site, it is not a designated area of public open space.

The site is identified in the Neighbourhood Plan as one of a number of 'areas of search for potential outdoor sports provision'. Pre-application discussions held with the Town Council confirmed that no further work had been undertaken in relation to such sites and no use of the land for sports provision had been identified. Neither the Town Council, nor sports clubs, have made any formal approaches to the landowner regarding such a use, since the Neighbourhood Plan was made.

The Town Council did express an interest in securing more informal public amenity space. The applicants have offered the land to the north of the application site (extending to 8ha), which was previously intended to be retained by the landowner, to be transferred to the Town Council for this purpose and this forms part of the S106 Heads of Terms. This would ensure the land remains as open space in perpetuity. The Council has confirmed that the agreed Section 106 contributions are sufficient for the ongoing maintenance of this land, should the Town Council accept the offer to transfer.

The latest housing delivery test found that delivery was 69% of the requirement over the last 3 years. The presumption in favour of development therefore applies. This site has been identified by the Council as an allocation for residential development in the emerging Dorset Local Plan.

We are therefore strongly of the view that there are no adverse impacts associated with the scheme which outweigh the range of substantial benefits, which include:

- provision of 20 much needed affordable homes
- creation and support of local jobs
- biodiversity enhancements
- provision of open space and play, including a substantial area of adjacent land, to the north, which is offered for public recreation and enjoyment.
- financial contributions towards enhanced community infrastructure including healthcare, education, libraries, sports provision and local bus services.

We therefore hope you support your officer's recommendation and approve this outline application.

Item 6 – P/RES/2021/01690 – Higher Blandford Road, Cann

Karen Tippins – Against the application

There is already excessive house building that has taken place in Shaftesbury without any roll out of required infrastructure and without Dorset Council releasing much needed s106 developer's contributions for the community's infrastructure. The last (small) Play Area built was in 2015 valued at only £28,000 using s106 from Persimmon, and yet over 800 houses have been built in Shaftesbury. Open Spaces have been left by developers and are unkempt with no equipment and have been in a dreadful state for years, submissions to address the need for community facilities to Dorset Council appears to take too long to move forward and still no delivery of community facilities. Roads are not getting adopted by Dorset Highways, and again, this goes on for years, if not a decade.

Dorset Council officers have stated officially to a Developer (Nylo Homes) there is an acute need for Affordable Housing in Shaftesbury for the controversial planning application 2/2020/0677/OUT. A Dorset Council officer stated 660 Affordable Houses needed, which locals believe to be a 'made up' figure by Dorset Council. There is no supporting evidence for any of these housing numbers supplied by Dorset Council to validate their authenticity. Also, the Affordable Houses are being transferred by developers to the company, Sovereign Housing, who don't appear to be giving these affordable houses to Locals. Why are these Affordable houses being built on valuable agricultural land, right next to the AONB and yet there is no visibility or justification or confirmation by Dorset Council that the houses really are going to locals. In the Dorset Council committee papers for this planning application, it states that there is an absence of a 5 year supply (section 2.0, bullet point 3), again, there are no statistics given to support this statement, at the Sth A30 135 housing planning application Planning Appeal, Dorset Council officers stated that Shaftesbury housing is 'saturated' and 'ahead of the curve' and yet for this planning application, Dorset Officers are saying the opposite. The arguments appear on 'grant' or 'refuse' appears to flip flop according to a desired 'outcome' and not based on brownfield site/greenfield/sensitive area. Please stop approving developments for Shaftesbury until you've proved to residents in Shaftesbury that the required infrastructure has been put in place to be able to cope with a further population expansion of the town.

In addition, please stop approving more houses until Dorset Council has a comprehensive renewable energy technology planning policy which mandates that developers must incorporate every possible and feasible technological solution possible for maximising the usage of renewable energy. It is a known policy 'gap' by the planning committee and there should be an action plan to address this key policy omission.

Bernard Ede – Against the application

Whilst acknowledging that some positive changes have been made in response to earlier comments, there remain significant short-comings.

I therefore Object to the above Application for the following reasons;

1 NO OVERALL SUSTAINABILITY CONCEPT nor STRATEGY; Contemporary measures for low-energy consumption, orientation of dwellings for solar gain, use of sustainable materials, recycling, stormwater management aren't addressed.

2 DETRIMENTAL VISUAL IMPACT;

There are no computer-based depictions of visual impact of the development & mitigating landscape measures from the AONB nor from the A30 towards the Chalk Downland skyline.

The development is within the setting of the AONB & detracts from it.

There's no representation of outward views from the development towards the public open-space nor AONB.

3 INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER;

The character is that of stand-alone, dense urbanisation in an isolated open field in Shaftesbury's rural hinterland.

It does not appear "landscape-led".

4 NO SUDS;

A conventional piped surface water drainage system is proposed, discharging to a large, publicly inaccessible detention basin.

The site plan lacks permeable paving, rainwater-collection tanks, rain gardens, swales (shallow grass ditches), & soakage areas which could retard rapid surface-water runoff & form an armature for the landscape structure threading through the development.

5 NO LOGICAL PLANTING STRATEGY;

There's no tree species & size hierarchy such as large native trees, 'Parkland', wetland, road & footway avenues, parking areas, domestic gardens.

Similarly, there's no hedge hierarchy such as native outer perimeter, semi-native park & roadside edges, & decorative species confined to domestic locations.

Magnolia along the entrance road & Hornbeam in the wetland area are inappropriate species

6 CONFLICT WITH EXISTING TREES;

Two existing large Oak in the A30 verge aren't shown in the proposals despite depiction on the site survey.

Two dwellings & combined footway/cycleway immediately abut these & will jeopardise their survival.

7 ROAD & PARKING INTRUSION INTO OPEN SPACE; Access roads off the entrance road to dwellings & visitor parking intrude into the open space & views to the development from the C13.

There is no screen planting such as hedging.

8 DWELLINGS IMMEDIATELY ABUT OPEN SPACE; A large section of the public open space perimeter is abutted by dwellings, walls & fences, whereas the Outline Scheme showed gardens & hedges.

9 FOOTWAYS IMMEDIATELY ABUT ENTRANCE ROAD; These appear superfluous unless they link to other footways & a road crossing. They create the impression of an over-engineered, hard, urban environment at the entrance.

10 NO LIGHTING DETAILS ;

In relation to Dark Skies Policy, views from AONB & how they interact with tree planting.

11 NO MAINTENANCE ZONING PLANS;

Zones of maintenance operations should be defined on plan & distinction made between establishment & maturation maintenance, including replacement conditions in the event of plant failure. Long-term maintenance responsibility should be defined.

Shaftesbury Town Council

Whilst the applicant has made revisions to the architecture of the development, we continue to object to the overall design, being neither modern nor rural in appearance. Of equal concern is the material harm we feel this application will inflict on the rural nature of the approach to our historic town and the fact that the site acts as the gateway to the Cranborne Chase AONB from Shaftesbury. We are also concerned that there is no provision for solar gain, either in the orientation of the houses or any proposed installations, to ensure a sustainable development.

We would like to draw the Committee's attention to the following policies:

NPPF, Paragraph 12, Achieving well-designed places, point 26. The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve

North Dorset Local Plan 2016, (NDLP) Policy 24: Design

Development should be designed to improve the character and quality of the area within which it is located. Proposals for development will be required to justify how the relevant aspects of development form address the relevant design principles and standards set out in Figures 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3 of this policy and how the design responds to the local context.

NPPF, Paragraph 13. Protecting Green Belt land

137. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

Paragraph 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

152. The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate.... It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions,

Planning for climate change

153. Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change,
155. To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should:

a) provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources

Paragraph 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

174. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes,
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside

NDLP, Policy 3: Climate Change

- b) be designed to make best use of solar radiation and passive cooling through the incorporation of passive solar design principles;

Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan: SFDH1; SFDH2; SFDH3; SFDH6; SFDH7; SFGI2; SFGI3; SFGI4

We request full weight is given to the submissions by Dorset Council's Senior Landscape Architect and Chartered Landscape Architect Bernard Ede; we wholly endorse their observations and objections.

We request that no works of any kind should commence until objections raised in these submissions are mitigated by improved cladding proposals to the buildings and all landscaping issues have been addressed with revised plans.

Melbury Abbas and Cann Parish Council

We refer to the above. We concur with the points that Shaftesbury Town Council made concerning this application.

Please note that approximately 50% of these proposed houses will actually be in the parish of Cann and not Shaftesbury and we want to ensure that the proportion of Section 106 monies that will be applicable will be forwarded to this Parish.

Also we wish to reiterate that the entrance for this proposed estate is on to a 'B' road and not a major 'A' road as indicated in the documentation.

Gregg Allison, Persimmon Homes – Applicant

Firstly, I would like to extend my gratitude to the Council for putting in the arrangements for this meeting to take place. I would also like to take this opportunity to commend your Officers for the positive and proactive way in which they have dealt with this application.

With regard to the merits of the proposal, this is a site that already benefits from outline planning permission, granted at appeal, for up to 55 dwellings.

The outline planning application was supported by illustrative details, informed by a LVIA that satisfied the Inspector that would be no unacceptable harm to the nearby AONBs. Had the Inspector believed that the development of the site was not acceptable in a form similar to that illustrated, then permission would have been withheld. This is the starting point for the consideration of this application.

In light of the findings of the Inspector, the design of this scheme deliberately aligns with the outline permission, including the retention of the views. This application proposes two-storey family housing, in keeping with residential character of the area that has regard to its sensitive setting.

The materials will taken into account those used in the vicinity. High quality brick will predominate with muted roof tiles to reduce their visual impact, particularly from long views. Stone fronted properties are proposed in key locations to add interest and refer back to the historic character of Shaftesbury.

Each property is to have high quality detailing and, as can be seen from the various revisions to the scheme, many amendments have been secured, including the provision of street trees, all to the overall betterment of the scheme.

Every home will have its own garden and parking. High quality and resilient landscaping is proposed throughout the site.

The submitted Sustainability Statement sets out the efficiencies of the houses above the Building Regulations baseline and details the infrastructure to be provided for electric car charging and solar PV panels.

Our developments often utilise local tradespeople and contractors. The group's average private selling price is significantly lower than the national average for newly built homes and around 50% are sold to first time buyers. The Group's HBF customer satisfaction has been ahead of the five star threshold since January 2020, illustrating the continued success of The Persimmon Way programme which aims to ensure we build good quality homes consistently.

In summary, the overall benefits of the development, notably the contribution towards the Council's recognised housing needs, would outweigh any short term impacts of the development.

I hope that these brief comments are helpful in determining the application.

Item 7 – P/FUL/2021/02870 – Land South of Newlands Manor House, Charlton Marshall

Charlton Marshall Parish Council

The Parish Council have no comments or objections in respect of the design and layout of the proposed development. But note that no detail has been provided in respect of the heights of the proposed houses, and it is not clear how visible they will be in the landscape, nor what their relative height would be to any new planting in the first few years.

There are however concerns around the location of the entrance/exit:

- The high volume of traffic using this major road (A350). Residents in the area already report difficulties turning out of driveways onto the road, the volume of traffic will be increased again by the Bellway development.
- Speed of traffic – although the major part of the A350 through the village is 30mph the Community Speedwatch team regularly record vehicles travelling at much higher speeds.
- This site is at the limit of the 30mph and therefore vehicles approaching from Blandford (on the site side) will be approaching at a greater speed.
- Due to the high volume and speed of traffic any pedestrian crossing consideration should be of a pedestrian controlled type, to ensure vehicles stop in both directions, particularly for the safety of children needing to cross this road.

The Parish Councillors were impressed with the reports from Dr Weir (Senior Conservation Officer) and Katherine Van Etten (Senior Landscape Architect) and would endorse KVE's comments.

Item 8 – 3/20/1328/FUL – Frogmore Lane, Sixpenny Handley

Stuart McLean – Against the application

My name is Stuart McLean and I wish to object in the strongest terms to the proposed planning application by Rushmore Estates and Midsummer Homes to site 7 new houses on the site of the field located at the junction of Frogmore Lane and Back Lane in Sixpenny Handley.

I have lived in Frogmore Farmhouse, which is located immediately opposite the proposed development site, for 25 years in which time the roadway in Frogmore Lane and Frogmore field opposite have flooded to a serious degree on four separate occasions, most recently in the winter of 2013/14

The junction of Frogmore Lane and Back Lane, where I live, lies at the very lowest point of the village, geographically speaking, which means that the combination of surface water and underground sewerage water combine above and below ground at this very junction, which at periods of excessive inclemency mean that the field and roadway flood to such depths that I lose access to my own house entrance on Frogmore Lane and have to revert to access from Back Lane .

I trust that you will be aware that this is not the first time that such an application has been submitted to develop this same field. In 1989 an application was made (Number 3/89/0773) by Rushmore Estates to build houses on the field. The Parish Council objected to this development on the grounds of surface water flooding in the immediate area. East Dorset District Council agreed with the Parish view and rejected the application. The developer, (O'Rourke plc) appealed the rejection and the Secretary of State appointed an Inspector to intervene. In 1992 he upheld the District Council's rejection in his 3 page report dated 3rd August 1992. The Inspector, in his report, said that he considered one of the main issues in the case to be whether surface water could be disposed of satisfactorily without leading to flooding on the site and elsewhere. In his conclusions at the end of his report the Inspector said: *"I have strong doubts that the problem of water backing up and onto the site can be overcome. I have concluded that surface water cannot be disposed of satisfactorily without leading to flooding on the site and elsewhere. I hereby dismiss this appeal"* Nothing, I would submit, has changed since that planning inspector's report which is as valid today as it was in 1992.

Mr A. Lithgow – Against the application

This application by Rushmore Farms Ltd and Midsummer Homes Ltd for seven new homes has been slightly amended this time around but it is substantially the same as the one submitted two years ago.

Therefore it will come as no surprise to anyone that my objection is the same as the one I put forward in 2020.

My concern is the flood risk that the development scheme poses not only to the proposed new homes but to those existing properties adjoining the development site – and to the surrounding roads as well.

The site has been flooded FOUR times in the previous 23 years during heavy rain.

Just 18 months ago, part of the field next to the site and the nearby highways, including Frogmore Lane and Back Lane, were awash with water after a downpour lasting barely 30 minutes.

Pictures have been taken of this event by a local parish councillor and are available on request.

I dread to think of what might have happened had the houses, envisaged in this plan, been built at the time.

In 1992 a planning inspector appointed by the then Secretary of State for the Environment upheld East Dorset District Council's decision to refuse planning permission to develop the Frogmore Lane field because of the flood perils involved.

Since then, meteorological experts have been warning consistently of the prospect of far more extreme rainy spells in the years to come due to the impact of climate change – a prediction endorsed by the respected environmental organisation Greenpeace which has recently declared that houses should never be built on land liable to flood.

The applicants themselves are clearly aware of the dangers. In their application document two years ago, in answer to the question 'Is the site within an area at risk of flooding?' they ticked the YES box.

I am puzzled as to how they could ever hope to get a decent price for these homes on the open market, given the risks involved.

That is assuming, of course, that properties are intended for sale, as opposed to being built as holiday lettings to cater for the staycation boom caused by the continuing uncertainty over foreign travel.

I ask the committee to reject this application.

Ian & Jackie Mereweather – Against the application

We strongly object to the proposed development in Frogmore Lane. The risk/benefit analysis of this application for only seven properties in this village is not attractive.

1. The developers have provided no substantial evidence or a convincing argument that the flooding risks which have previously been the basis for refusal of consent (in 1992) have diminished. The arguments they have deployed on past flooding to support their application have been shown to be selective and subjective. The actual evidence of experience provided by me and other villagers who have lived here for many years clearly supports a basis for concern.

2. Wessex Water acknowledges the particular issues that have arisen regarding foul water dispersal in the village and have raised them during this application. To date

little substantial additional work to upgrade foul water defences have been put in place.

3. The application includes proposals to now include access off Red Lane. A narrow, tricky single track road which is used as a commuter "rat run" to bypass the village centre. This development has the potential to significantly increase the probability for traffic accidents and risk to pedestrians.

4. There are other areas within the village envelope which provide opportunity for further residential development including affordable housing which attract none of the attendant flooding risk or traffic risk that this application brings.

Mrs W Vaughan – Against the application

I am writing to you to express my opposition to planning application 3/20/1328/FUL.

This is for seven new houses with garages and ancillary car parking at Frogmore Lane, Sixpenny Handley.

My objection is on the same grounds as it was the last time a planning application for the same site was submitted two years ago.

I do not see that the flood risk assessment and surface water strategy amendment contained in the very latest application alters the situation in any meaningful way.

Put simply, I believe now, as I did before, that the development will expose the new houses, and existing homes next to the site, to the threat of flooding.

I do not think the situation has changed since a Government Inspector rejected plans for housing on the site 30 years ago, citing the flood risk as his reason for doing so.

His fears have been amply confirmed by several flooding incidents over the past few years, one of the worst being in August 2020 when parts of Frogmore Lane and Back Lane were left under water after a rain storm lasting less than half an hour.

Photos of this event can be supplied if required.

It should be born in mind that, according to the Met Office, our changing climate will mean that these extreme weather episodes will increasingly become the norm, rather than the exception.

Please reject this latest application.

Colin & Louise Chambers – Against the application

We wish to object in the strongest possibly way, to the proposed development in respect of planning application 3/20/1328/FUL.

As a resident of Paddock Close for the last 32 years this field has been the subject of several planning proposals, all of which have been rejected by residents and Sixpenny Handley & Pentridge Parish Council.

The field in question is located to the east of the village and is the lowest point within the boundary of Sixpenny Handley, the site is a natural soakaway for water runoff for most of the village and as a result often floods in frequent prolonged and heavy rain into Frogmore Lane and Back Lane and then into Manor Farm and farmhouse.

The River Allen runs under the village along Dean Lane eastward to Frogmore Lane and, then towards the A345 when it rises above ground generally in the Winter, the area is listed by the Environment Agency as a flood plain.

We are aware that our Parish Council do not object to further development of the village, and a number of new developments have recently taken place, along with new planning permission for 12 houses with access from Back Lane, our objection is to the development of sites that are subject to regular and serious flooding.

Governments are now insisting that ZERO carbon emissions are a target to reverse the effects of Global Warming which is leading to severe weather events and catastrophic flooding.

Why fly in the face of the government edict that houses should **not** be developed on flood plains, which this field most certainly is.

Holly Gatrell – Against the application

I do not believe the suggested improvements will mitigate the flooding which happens periodically in the area and this is a flood plain. I have witnessed this flooding and the road is 1-2ft deep of water all around the Paddock fields at this time of year when it floods.

I have followed all the correspondence regarding this and the developers have not allayed my fears.

Patrick & Diana Chick – Against the application

We were appalled to hear of yet another planning application by Midsomer Homes and the Rushmore Estate for 7 houses to be built on the Frogmore Field.

This has already been turned down 3 or more times as the field is on a floodplain and regularly floods. The government announced only a few months ago that development of floodplain sites is now forbidden.

We live in Manor Farm next to the site and have regularly been flooded right through our own house and farm yard. We are sitting over the head waters of the River Allen.

We are at the bottom of the catchment area from the main Village Street; Dean Lane, which takes all the rain from the surrounding hills and the main spring at Woodyates Manor.

All the water from the A354 / B3081 roundabout all comes down to Red Lane and onto Back Lane and is susceptible to serious flooding.

Back Lane becomes impassable as the water lifts the foundations of the road and several feet of water over it, trapping cars and any vehicles that try to drive through it.

The number of houses in the Parish that flood now is growing with extreme weather conditions. Elderly and disabled people who live in these houses worry and are distressed.

Building more houses on this site will add to their anxiety. Red Lane is so narrow that is difficult to get 2 small cars to pass on it.

The Rushmore Estate already has other sites in the village which do not flood and could be developed.

James & Leanne Chick – Against the application

We are surprised and concerned to hear of yet another planning application being submitted by Midsomer Homes and Rushmore Estate for 7 houses to be built on the Frogmore Field.

We met representatives from Midsomer Homes last at a Parish Council meeting which was well attended by many who live in the village & near the site.

At this meeting we informed both the Midsomer Homes and their structural engineering/flood expert that Frogmore Field is a designated flood area and in the past it has severely flooded many times with most of the field being completely under water for many weeks. The water runs off from the field, breaching the lower banks and flows onto backlane road causing erosion to tarmac, potholes and making the road impassable to cars or pedestrians due to the depth of the water. A unanimous vote at this meeting was to reject the planning proposal. Flooding being one of the main reasons, along with many others. Nothing has changed in this application at the proposed site that would eliminate the risk of severe flooding.

With the government announcement that development of floodplain sites is forbidden, this proposal to build houses, garages, concrete & tarmac on a flood area, should not be allowed.

We live at The Tallut, Manor Farm and our house is down from this site. We already get flood water in our yard and buildings when the spring rise of the River Allen occurs with wet weather.

Since many fields and traditional soak away areas in the lower village have been built upon over recent times, the occurrence of flooding has increased, due to there being far more surface run off and little natural soak away capacity. The Frogmore Field site has acted as one of the last areas adjacent to village houses to absorb some of this rainwater/runoff from further up in the village.

The number of houses in the Parish that flood now is growing with the ever increasing extreme weather conditions, causes distress and damage for those residents who live in these houses nearby. Building more houses on this site will exacerbate their anxiety and add to flood issues.

Red Lane is a single lane narrow road with the only passing area being at the midway point, which is now the proposed entrance/exit to the site. This will cause huge traffic issues for any large commercial or HGV vehicles that use this road to bypass the main village high street, as well as the many cars that regularly use this route.

The Rushmore Estate already has other sites in the village which do not flood and would be more suitable to development.

Mr Paul New – Against the application

I was dismayed and alarmed to find that another revision to the planning application has been submitted for the parcel of land in Sixpenny Handley bounded by Frogmore lane, Back Lane and Red Lane.

I wish to object, in principle, to the granting of any planning permission for this field as it is non-viable and detrimental to the village as a whole and the surrounding inhabitants on the following grounds:-

- This field is subject to flooding during heavy rainfall.
- The field acts as a drainage sump for rain water as it is sited at the bottom of the village. A development on this site would have a catastrophic effect on the adjoining estate known as The Paddocks, causing flooding and exacerbating the current issue in Frogmore Lane despite the proposed 'improvements to drainage' mentioned in the application title. We have all seen the effects of building on land subject to flooding, despite mitigation mentioned in planning applications. Developers should not continue to be allowed to build on inappropriate sites.
- There is a current issue, known to Wessex Water, of capacity with both surface and sewerage drainage. A development on this site would surely prove the last straw causing widespread problems throughout Sixpenny Handley.
- The field is a green field site.
- The development will add to the present flood risk and there appears to be no mitigation of this or any attempt to prevent exacerbating the current flooding situation.
- There is sufficient new building in progress or planned for this village which includes provision for low cost housing.
- A previous planning application (1992) was rejected because of flooding risk. Nothing has changed in the intervening time to the surrounding area and we now suffer more concentrated and heavier rainfall due to climate change. Hence planning permission should be denied as the flooding risk remains or has increased.

- Allowing new building on this site flies in the face of the Government edict that houses should not be built on flood plains, which this field most certainly is.

David Chick, Chairman of Planning, Sixpenny & Pentridge Parish Council

My Name is David Chick and I am the current chairman of Planning for our parish council. I am writing to strongly object to the terms to the proposed planning application by Rushmore Estates and Midsummer Homes to site 7 new houses on the site of the field located at the junction of Frogmore Lane and Back Lane in Sixpenny Handley.

I have lived at Manor farm, Sixpenny Handley for 53 years, so have a lot of experience of the groundwater and flooding in this area. As Manor farm lies at the lowest part of the village all the surface run off, flood waters and sewage end up flooding the farm house and our land. This has happened on numerous occasions in the past and causes huge damage and disruption.

With regards to the facts, this application has been submitted several times with minor adjustments and has been rejected each time. Many local people I have spoken to recently, believe this is the wrong location for development due to their knowledge of the groundwater situation over many decades. This Knowledge should not be ignored. This field has always flooded, and been a useful soakaway sump for all the runoff from development in the village.

There are plenty of other areas in the village more suitable for development that have no flood risk attached to them.

Government policy is not to build on areas susceptible to flooding and this field is in a flood risk area. With a changing climate, these flooding issues will occur more frequently.

On appeal the secretary of state's inspector said: "I have strong doubts that the problem of water backing up and onto the site can be overcome. I have concluded that surface water cannot be disposed of satisfactorily without leading to flooding on the site and elsewhere. I hereby dismiss this appeal" This planning inspector's report is as valid today as it was in 1992.

The comments "leading to flooding on the site and elsewhere" are very relevant, especially to Manor Farm.

As chair of the Planning committee, I have received a lot of comments and correspondence on this application, all strongly objecting. I also strongly object to the application.

Cliff Lane, Savills – Agent

Chair, we welcome the case officer's comprehensive report to you, which recommends this application for approval, subject to conditions. We believe the report tackles all the planning issues in an objective way. Her summary of her findings on the application on her first page, at the foot of page 81, and her conclusion at the top of page 90 deal with matters succinctly.

We won't repeat her positive conclusions on the key issues on page 82, nor her more comprehensive planning assessment, starting on page 87, save to say her assessment and conclusion are both fair and objective.

We do note the Parish Council objects to the application, as well as several local residents. We feel all the matters raised as objections have been well covered in the officer's report.

We would like to elaborate on one fundamental objection, which has been cited against the proposal, that of potential flooding. From the outset, the applicants have done all they can to ensure this issue is dealt with, in respect of the site itself and any areas outside of the site.

Comprehensive technical reports were prepared and shared with the Council and its flood advisors. Whilst the whole of the site is in the applicants' control only approximately half is proposed for the 7 dwellings. A comprehensive surface water drainage scheme is proposed, which holds excess surface water on the site in tanks, for it to be released gradually to avoid any surges. It also ensures surface water does not enter the foul drainage system, which we understand has been a problem in the past in Sixpenny Handley.

In summary, the proposals adequately deal with potential flooding issues on site, whilst ensuring run-offs are no worse than at present, and ensure no surface water enters foul drains.

Picking up a few other issues raised:

- No affordable housing is proposed as the scheme of 7 is under the Council's threshold of 10.
- No external lighting is proposed to respect the AONB location
- Natural England, Wessex Water, Dorset Council Highways do not object to the application.

The case officer is also correct in concluding that:

- The principle of development is acceptable, as the site is within the village settlement boundary.
- The development does not harm the AONB, and the design is acceptable.
- There would be no significant impact on neighbours' amenity.
- Loss of view and value are not planning matters.

Thank you

Item 9 – P/FUL/2021/02897 – Land Adjacent to 362 Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall

Mr D Forrest & Miss K Knight – Against the application

The “Report” mentions the impact on other bungalows in May Grove, but nothing on No.11, our beloved home and garden. It states that the extra drive would be made private for the 5 houses only but with no gate allowed how would it be made private? Any member of the public, driving or walking could enter the site off the A350 main road. Our very necessary important security and privacy would be lost. For us at no.11 this would be a disaster.

The proposed application for an “Access Driveway” on the northern side, would also seriously affect no.11 by introducing regular traffic particularly at rush hour periods early in the morning and in the evening, very intrusive, continuous “SIGHT” of traffic, engine and tyre “NOISE”, exhaust “FUMES”, vehicle headlights shining into our rooms and light pollution from the driveway lighting all along the “80 metres” of the rear of our garden. The far end of our garden (only 15 metres wide) is by the A350 but distant sight and sound etc., of traffic is protected from us by the road being well down in a dip.

All Vehicles entering the first relatively flat 5 metres of the proposed “Access Driveway” with 1 in 12 slope would then be immediately asked to climb a severe hill over the second 5 metres x 5 metre high, 12 in 12 slope leading to the proposed dwelling side. The danger this poses is there to all to see and how (pedestrians would negotiate it, getting up and down with no pathways) we fail to see. A Visit to the site would confirm the unsafe high slope.

This “severe” slope could not be levelled out as the existing sewerage pipe (from the coach house and bungalow in the field) crosses this drive at the top of the slope approximately 2 metres below the surface, into the collection chamber in No 11’s garden. Therefore, not allowing reduction in the excessive climb.

Inclement weather rain & ice etc., on the slope would make it slippery and vehicles could easily slide all along the entire narrow length, down into the A350, not a country lane but a SERIOUSLY “Busy” main road, which is becoming busier all the time.

The current soakaway is insufficient and already floods, this water with no barrier would flow down into the main road, soakaways would seem not be sufficient.

This is an Ecological Danger to people’s lives and it would surely create accidents waiting to happen.

Elaine Leney – Against the application

I totally object to the above Planning Application on the grounds that it is an unnecessary and intrusive development.

It would have a huge impact on my privacy as the houses would be close and so much taller than my bungalow that they would completely overlook my bedroom, lounge and garden. They would also cut out sunlight during the winter months.

The style and finish of the proposed houses are entirely out of keeping with the surrounding dwellings.

The influx of a potential 25+ persons in the population would put additional strain on the local amenities and the extra vehicles associated with such a compact development would create increased gas pollution and noise. This goes against the national policies on 'green living'.

The access and egress to and from the development to the already narrow and bending A350 would create problems and the likelihood of it becoming an accident 'black spot'.

It would completely spoil the rural approach to the village from the south and a view that we all value.

I might add that after talking to the occupants of other properties backing on to the development site, I have discovered there was no prior consultation with any of us from Mr and Mrs Adcook.

Mr & Mrs Tansey – Against the application

Need: Charlton Marshall and surrounding area has had much recent development. Planning Support Statement (PSS) has excessive wordage but no fact-based demonstration of "an overriding need" for countryside development outside the settlement boundary to satisfy pre-application response (PAR).

Density: PSS states 13 dph as 6 dwellings on 0.45 hectares compared to 15dph surrounding. PAR states area 0.4 hectares, so density is 15dph, same not less. PSS states "The Council stated that the site was suitable for a similar density character" whereas PAR states "density *below* 15dph". A "transition" infers decline in density from 15 to 0 so reasonable expectation is 7.5dph: 3 dwellings.

Access: Access by way of the Northern part of the site is the most intrusive location for the residents of May Grove in terms of noise and headlights in the hours of darkness. Southern access would be more considerate and further from the bends in the busy A350.

Overlooking: Ground floor windows Plot 1 & 2 and first floor French doors and window Plot 3 overlook May Grove houses. Plot 3 garage needlessly close to no. 19.

Character: Design inconsistent with nearby properties. Currently edge of Charlton Marshall is barely seen from main road. 362 Bournemouth Road is well hidden on approach. Only glimpses of May Grove properties. Proposed development is hard view of dwellings and a detriment to village character.

Precedent: Changes soft South boundary to hard boundary a step closer to Spetisbury. With development in the North towards Lower Blandford St. Mary we are

perilously close to a combined “Spetisbury Marshall St. Mary” instead of three separate villages with their own character. Villagers resent “merging by stealth” from development of land between villages.

Community Support: PAR states “I would encourage early engagement... discussing your proposals with your neighbours and the Parish Council prior to the submission”. Not done: some neighbours not informed at all and others within a week of the application. No date for submission advised and no attempt to gain feedback. Parish Council was not engaged.

Residential Amenity: Applicants previously allowed neighbours to cross field to railway: a key facility for local access. It would be simple to reserve strips of land to provide access for May Grove houses facing development: giving something back to compensate the loss of view. Given precedent for railway access in recent The Old Orchard development, proposal should include access to facing properties for safe, peaceful, pollution free route to local walks, Blandford and Spetisbury including the school and other amenities. Without such provision the opportunity to continue to access the railway is forever lost.

Mr & Mrs Maidment – Against the application

We object to this application.

In 1960 when Meadow Road Estate was built, it was known a Nursery Estate. The developer was H Hawkins Ltd of Bournemouth. May Grove was part of a field that belonged to The Lodge, 362 Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall in 1960. The owner of the Lodge applied to develop the field but was refused on the grounds that the ‘access’ was far too ‘dangerous’ onto the A350, so half the field was sold to Hawkins Ltd. They built May Grove with access into Meadow Road. The other half of the field behind the Lodge, 362 Bournemouth Road, had to be left as ‘Green Belt’

Between the boundary of Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury, also the footpath. The access was in the same position as it is proposed now and the traffic is now 8 times heavier than was then. There has already been one accident with someone coming out of the Lodge onto the A350. If this plan is approved, there will be three entrances onto the A350 from the Lodge. All the entrances are of single lane design with no indication of two lanes or one way traffic. Also, how would the builders traffic get in and out of the site as the sewer goes across between the Lodge and No.11 May Grove. There is no sewerage in that part of the A350, so how could the access be lowered?

In the late 1970’s planning was again applied for and again refused as the access was too dangerous out onto the A350.

When part 2 of the May Grove development was started in August 1963, the agreement was that no means of access for pedestrians or vehicular access shall be constructed onto the A350. Is the agreement of ‘Green Belt’ land between Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury still in law being Spetisbury has the Glebe ground field next to Charlton Marshall boundary dividing the 2 villages?

Our village wants affordable homes that local people can afford, not big 4 bedroom properties.

Charlton Marshall Parish Council

Charlton Marshall Parish Council unanimously objects to this planning application.

The concerns are as follows:

- This development is unlikely to meet local housing needs as the properties are likely to be unaffordable to residents and their families who want to remain in the village.
- The number of houses and whether the location is sustainable. It is felt that 6 houses is too many for the site, particularly due to the size of the proposed dwellings in relation to the pre-existing adjacent bungalows on May Grove.
- The site is outside of the settlement boundary and would be highly visible from the road and railway, therefore being visually intrusive in the landscape. The development would alter the entrance to the village.?? would extend the village southwards into open countryside, thereby opening up the distinct possibility of future development encroaching onto greenfield land that forms the separation between Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury.
- The hazardous entrance/exit onto the site. 362 has 2 entrances, one being on a 40 mph section of the A350 and the other on a 30 mph. This means that high numbers of vehicles are still travelling at 40 mph when they reach the proposed entrance. The entrances are on the bend of the road with poor visibility inwards and outwards. It should also be noted there is no pavement, making it very hazardous for pedestrians/cyclists emerging at this location, Furthermore, vehicles leaving the driveway would immediately be on the road. The A350 is a very busy road during the hours of 0700 – 1800. Community Speedwatch records numbers of vehicles at approx 600 -1000 an hour, this includes a high number of HGVs. The steep gradient of the driveway raises safety issues particularly when there is water and or ice on the roads. If the initial section of the driveway was to be levelled the issue of the steepness of the remaining driveway is still not dealt with. There are issues around the sewer location and how close to the surface of the driveway it would be if the surface were to be levelled. There is no detail of the intended width of the driveway and if two-way traffic could pass safely.
- Negative impact on neighbouring properties, loss of privacy, increase in light and noise pollution. No detail has been provided over the planned height of these houses!
- This development would be out of keeping with the character of No 362 and the surrounding estate of bungalows.

Ken Parke, Ken Parke Planning Consultants – Agent

The inclusion of this small parcel of land is a logical extension of the settlement boundary. The land is bounded on 2 sides by the existing settlement boundary and by the redundant railway line on the 3rd side. The inclusion of the land results in a logical squaring off, of the village rather than an encroachment into open countryside.

There is thus logic to develop the site despite the housing supply position. The automatic presumption however does apply, and its application, would favour development contiguous to settlements as opposed to within the open countryside away from a settlement.

The settlement is identified as sustainable and the additional modest housing development will assist, support and maintain local services and facilities.

The widened access point into the site is already approved and considered acceptable. The proposed access to the rear will regrade the land so that the correct gradient can be achieved.

The access is safe with adequate visibility and the Highway Officer raises no objection.

The houses are all of individual, traditional appearance and designed utilising appropriate materials.

The density is purposefully low with the houses situated on reasonable sized plots. The Officer's Report confirms that there will be minimal visual impact from the A350 or from the adjoining railway.

The proposals will sit comfortably as a low-density village fringe development.

The dwellings will be visible from adjoining residential properties to the north. The careful design and siting of the dwellings however ensures adequate separation distances with no opportunities for loss of privacy or any other harmful impacts. The proposals step down towards the common boundary. There will be change in outlook however the relationships are not harmful.

This modest, well designed residential development will provide more housing in a logical and appropriate manner relative to the settlement boundary. Development of this site will also assist Members resist development that may place reliance on housing supply, in less appropriate locations either locally or across the district.

Members are respectfully requested to support the Officer's recommendations

This page is intentionally left blank