



Northern Area Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, 14 October 2025
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: Stour Hall - The Exchange, Old Market Hill, Sturminster Newton, DT10 1FH

Members (Quorum: 6)

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

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

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

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

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

Agenda

Item	Pages
1. APOLOGIES	
To receive any apologies for absence.	
2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
To disclose any pecuniary, other registerable or non-registerable interests as set out in the adopted Code of Conduct. In making their disclosure councillors are asked to state the agenda item, the nature of the interest and any action they propose to take as part of their declaration.	
If required, further advice should be sought from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.	

3. MINUTES 3 - 10

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 8th July 2025.

4. REGISTRATION FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING AND STATEMENTS

Members of the public wishing to speak to the Committee on a planning application should notify the Democratic Services Officer listed on the front of this agenda. This must be done no later than two clear working days before the meeting. Please refer to the Guide to Public Speaking at Planning Committee. [Guide to Public Speaking at Planning Committee](#)

The deadline for notifying a request to speak is 8.30am on 10th October 2025.

5. P/FUL/2025/03818, BLANDFORD ST MARY C OF E VA PRIMARY SCHOOL BIRCH AVENUE BLANDFORD ST MARY DT11 9QD. 11 - 22

Part of the existing modular building to be demolished and proposed to be used as playground is built on Dorset Council-owned land.

6. P/FUL/2024/06927, LAND SOUTH OF BOLNEY, SALISBURY ROAD, BLANDFORD FORUM DT11 7SP. 23 - 52

Erect 33 No. dwellings with garages and parking. Form vehicular access from Salisbury Road, associated infrastructure and public open space. Carry out site preparation and ancillary works.

7. URGENT ITEMS

To consider any items of business which the Chairman has had prior notification and considers to be urgent pursuant to section 100B (4) b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

The reason for the urgency shall be recorded in the minutes.

8. EXEMPT BUSINESS

There are no exempt items scheduled for this meeting.



NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 8 JULY 2025

Present: Cllrs Alex Brenton, Barrie Cooper, Les Fry, Sherry Jespersen, Carole Jones, Rory Major, Val Potheary, Belinda Ridout, James Vitali and Carl Woode

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

Lara Aintree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Cass Worman (Planning Officer), John Miles (Democratic Services Officer) and Annabel Cox (Planning Officer).

74. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Cllr David Taylor.

75. Declarations of Interest

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

76. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 27th May 2025 were confirmed and signed.

77. Registration for public speaking and statements

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

78. P/FUL/2024/04528, Garages at Wingfield Road, Sherborne, DT9 3HH

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. The application was to demolish a block of 48 garages, 37 which were currently occupied. The garages were mostly used for storage, and it was estimated that 5 garages were used for cars. The site would be redeveloped with two dwellings including landscaping and associated works. Each parking space would have electric charging stations. The Highway Authority was satisfied with road safety and parking.

Public Participation

Cllr Jon Andrews spoke as a member of the public and not as a Councillor. He had been a resident of Wingfield Road between 1969 to 1975 and remembered playing

football around there, but this morning a fire engine would not have been able to get around from the Richmond Road junction along Wingfield Road due to the number of parked vehicles. He informed that Wingfield Road has 72 houses in total, and not one parking space was available in Wingfield Road which is a hazard to public safety. The houses were a very nice design but just in the wrong place. There was one car parked and this morning 4 vans. He asked the Committee to not accept the application, as the sheltered accommodation needed emergency vehicle access, which would not have been able to get there this morning, without damaging and moving vehicles due to parked vehicles. The garages were for people who were self-employed, and demolishing these garages would mean that these people would have to find other garages which there is none available in Sherborne.

Ms Lindridge explained that she was a resident of half acres, and many residents were elderly and disabled and her living room and bedroom was 7 foot away from the garages. There would be a loss of privacy, dust upheaval and traffic disruption and essential services would be at risk. She wanted a peaceful life and did not want the hassle that the demolition would bring.

Ms Day informed that amenities, fire services, ambulances came in most days, and supermarket vans needed to get in and out and residents relied on taxis and cars to take them into town, and were unable to park in their own parking spaces as lots of car park on Wingfield Road. She stated that the Council should consider the implications on behalf of the residents, and there was 7 feet between the garages and herself. Some residents had crutches, wheelchairs, mobility scooters, and needed those pavements to use and not cars parked on them. As for drop down curves people park on them and ambulances and fire services would not be able to get in.

Andrew Tregay (the Agent for the application) explained that the application was to create two new dwellings in a highly sustainable location, a short distance from the town centre and no doubt a suitable location for two dwellings. There had been no technical objections from the Council specialist officers or highway officers. He acknowledged that there had been some concerns from residents over the parking situation and he reiterated what was set out in the officer report. It was a private garage block, not associated with any other specific development, was not a part of the Council's parking strategy and did not have any obligations to maintain parking space for any particular properties. The garages supported a low number of cars and were reaching the end of their life span. 25% of the units were currently vacant and the applicant did not monitor the units but were used mostly for storage rather than parking and the units were too small to store modern vehicles. The houses would be limited to 1 and a half storeys, have electric charging points, and there were no technical reasons for why this application should be refused.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Fry asked why people were parking on the roads and if they were working locally or was it due to free parking?**
- **Cllr Jespersen asked about the access by emergency vehicles and delivery vans to the bungalows.**

- Cllr Crabb commented that Half Acres behind did get a high number of emergency vehicles, more than you would in the normal neighbourhood, as carers park there.
- Cllr Vitali commented that development would intensify the parking situation, and it was important that the applicants did not intensify parking issues.
- Cllr Rideout requested reassurance that the height of the dwellings would not impact the enjoyment of the neighbours' gardens or create overshadowing.
- Cllr Jespersen commented that it was a private site, and the landowner could decide to demolish the garages and use the site for anything else at any time. Parking at Wingfield Road was not a relevant issue to the application, and the only thing that the committee should consider is if it exacerbated the issues on the roads. There were adequate gardens and there were no grounds to refuse the application.
- Cllr Brenton commented that the dwellings would be built to modern standards, insulated, she added that this was a planning application rather than a parking application.

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

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report and in the appendix.

79. **P/FUL/2023/01247, 10 High East Street, Dorchester, DT1 1HS**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. The application was to erect a first-floor extension to provide 1 No. unit of residential accommodation. The roof was designed to protect the amenity of the window. There would be no direct overlooking, and the second room was intended to be office store, rather than a bedroom. The application was in a town centre location, with a variety of buildings. The roof was designed so that light could reach the window and there would be no blocking of the window and light of the window would not be significantly impacted as it was East facing.

Public Participation

Mr Kendle lived at 5 Icen Mews, the back-wall of the proposed development was the back-wall of his courtyard garden, and this wall was less than 12 metres from the living room of his house. He explained the overbearing nature of the proposal, and he referenced that the officers report stated that the development would not be overbearing due to the courtyard already experiencing an enclosed character and the development only amounted to an additional 60cm of height of the party-wall. He explained that the officers report underplayed the effect of the development. The boundary wall at the end of his garden was already the tallest

structure enclosing the space, and crucially, it was the only boundary visible directly from his living room. This made it the most prominent feature from both inside his home and garden.

The proposal sought to significantly increase the height of that wall, with a sloping roof rising further behind it. That change significantly worsened the sense of enclosure and visual dominance of the structure, contrary to the protections offered by Policy 25 of the North Dorset Local Plan, which required development to safeguard the amenity of existing residents, including protection from overbearing structures and loss of outlook. This development only represents an additional 60cms of height.

The officer's report included that the proposal would only amount to a roughly 60cm increase in height, or a 14% increase in the height of the current party-wall. He informed that this claim was inaccurate and disingenuous for two reasons: The report stated the additional height of the party-wall is 60cms but the sloping roof, rises above the party-wall by a further 140cms and that the highest point was 100cms back from the party-wall. A 200cm increase was significantly higher than a 60cm one that the report drew your attention to.

The architectural drawings on which the 60cm figure was based were inaccurate because they: Stipulated that the floor-space between the current ground-floor and the new first-floor was 14cms when at a minimum, taking into account joists and fire-protection, it would need to be at least 29cms. The drawings also indicated that the current parapet wall is 429cms high, but he measured it, and it was only 402cms at its highest point and 390cms at its lowest. Therefore, allowing for a realistic depth of floor-space, and for the actual height of the parapet wall, the party-wall would need to be 114cms higher than the parapet wall currently is at its lowest point, and, when including the sloping roof, the development would be 254cms higher than the current wall. So rather than the 14% increase in the height suggested in the officer's report, this development actually amounted to a 63.5% increase in height. He concluded that it would significantly overshadow and overbear the property and the inaccuracy in the drawings suggested that the architectural drawings could not be trusted and therefore, any development would be based upon must be objected.

Ms Pacitti explained that she was the co-owner of 10A High East Street, situated directly to the west of 10 High East Street. Her property featured a single window in the upstairs rear room, which served as the exclusive source of external light for that space. The proposed construction would significantly diminish the amount of light entering the room. Although the height of the build had been reduced, it would negatively affect the light levels, and the impact would be more pronounced in winter exacerbating the concern. During winter months, light availability was already limited, necessitating an increase in natural light rather than a decrease. This development would result in an exceedingly gloomy environment, requiring artificial lighting even during daytime hours.

The proposed construction posed a severe infringement on her established right to light, which had been recognized for over two decades. The flat roof adjacent to her property raised significant concerns, as it could lead to damp issues due to the accumulation of rainwater and debris. She requested clarification regarding the method of joining the flat roof to her structure and the direction of water runoff.

Under the current proposals, there appeared to be no provision for runoff management, leading to the potential trapping of water in the channel between the front and rear elevations. She expressed concern regarding several vents for her bathroom and kitchen located on the wall designated for construction. There were legitimate worries about the possibility of these outlets becoming obstructed. The current submission did not adequately address how these concerns would be mitigated, and she remained sceptical that a party wall agreement would provide a solution. The proposed construction would infringe upon the privacy of her rear balcony, as it would be directly overlooked by the new build, which featured windows facing her property.

The area was already densely built and lacked privacy; this development would exacerbate that issue. The new placement of the extractor fan—now positioned lower between 9 High East Street and 10A High East Street, and at the same height as her window—raised additional concerns. The odour from the extractor could become confined between the front and rear elevations, significantly impacting the upstairs room. The existing odour report was insufficient, as it did not consider the new circumstances in which odour could be channelled and trapped in the corridor formed between the adjacent buildings. She raised reservations regarding the implications of ongoing maintenance for the property, particularly given that it was located in a conservation area. The proposed development would restrict access to the rear and side of her building, thereby hindering the ability to perform routine repairs to the roof, walls, and balcony. This could have detrimental effects on her property, and the revised plans fail to address these concerns.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Jespersen commented that she was not confident that the layout of the development was the best use of space in terms of living conditions. She questioned whether the committee could add conditions that prevents future occupiers from using the area designated as an office as a bedroom. She queried the amenities of the flat itself and whether residents had any access to outside space for drying washing, putting out their bins and a place to park their bike. She commented about the odour in small spaces and that odours can settle. She raised concerns with the flat roof, concerns with flue, smaller lobby, loss of light to the living room of 10 a. The development was overbearing on the courtyard garden of number 10 a, and no place for domestic living.**
- **Cllr Fry raised concerns over the noise and smell and the flat roof being very hard to maintain and could leak. There would be a loss of privacy to the area and potential damage to surrounding buildings.**
- **Cllr Potheary expressed concerns that there were too many problems that would need to be put right by condition. She would have preferred to see method statement put in with the documents. She was most concerned about the flue, in line with balcony in 10 A sitting out there being on the same level, would be appalling. If approved the development would be half built before we realised all sorts of issues.**

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

Decision: To refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below and in the appendix.

Reasons for refusals:

The proposal would lead to a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of 10A High East Street due to inadequate daylight to the living space of the adjacent property due to the proximity height and design of the proposed development, contrary to Policy ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

The proposal would lead to a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of 5 Icen Mews due to overbearing and overshadowing of the garden area of the adjacent property due to the proximity height and design of the proposed development, contrary to Policy ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

The proposal due to its size and layout would fail to make sufficient provision for bin stores, recycling facilities, drying areas, cycle parking, mobility scooter storage and private amenity/garden space and associated storage and composting facilities, which would adversely impact on the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed residential unit, contrary to policy ENV.11 and ENV16 of the West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan.

80. **P/LBC/2023/01251, 10 High East Street, Dorchester, DT1 1HS**

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. This application was to consider the listed building consent and looking at the impact only on heritage assets and the historic fabric of the building.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Jespersen commented that she did not see any reason for why this application should be refused listed building consent as the Conservation Officers were keen on the improvements this development would bring.**

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning

permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Rideout.

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report and in the appendix.

81. **P/HOU/2024/06120, Sunnydale, White Lackington, Piddletrenthide DT2 7QU**

Cllr Vitali left the meeting at 12:33 and gave his apologies.

With the aid of a visual presentation including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and explained the proposal and relevant planning policies to members. The application was to demolish store and erect a two Bay Garage/Workshop. Photographs of the map showed the location, in an AONB. The site access, tree protection plan and the full extent of vegetation along northern boundary were presented to the Committee.

Public Participation

No public participation.

Members questions and comments

- **Cllr Brenton asked if there was rainwater collection on the building and she appreciated the solar panels on the roof and suspended floor.**
- **Cllr Rideout asked about the back access and whether there were bat boxes.**
- **Cllr Fry asked about a water retention condition and some form of water storage on the site.**

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

Decision: To grant planning permission with conditions and for the reasons set out in the officer's report and in the appendix.

82. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

83. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 12.48 pm

Chairman

.....

Application Number:	P/FUL/2025/03818
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Blandford St Mary C Of E Va Primary School Birch Avenue Blandford St Mary DT11 9QD
Proposal:	Single storey extension. (Demolish existing modular building).
Applicant name:	Blandford St Mary C.E. Primary School
Case Officer:	Claire Lewis
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Cooper

1. Reason application is going to committee:

Part of the existing modular building to be demolished and proposed to be used as playground is built on Dorset Council-owned land.

2. Summary of recommendation:

GRANT subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report.

3. Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	Land was designated for educational use, and this application accords with that continued use. Demolition of existing modular building and erection of single storey extension to main school building, with land on which modular building currently sits to be used as playground is acceptable as there is no net loss of play area or playing fields.
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	The scale and design of the proposed extension are appropriate to the setting and the existing buildings on site, with no harm to the character or appearance of the area.
Impact on the living conditions neighbouring properties	There is no demonstrable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
Impact on landscape or heritage assets	There is no demonstrable harm to landscape character or heritage assets.
Flood risk and drainage	There are no known flood risk or drainage issues on the site.

Issue	Conclusion
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	There is no demonstrable risk to highway safety, and no proposed changes to existing access or parking arrangements.
Impact on trees	There is no demonstrable risk to trees on the site.
Biodiversity	The proposal is exempt from providing biodiversity net gain as it falls below the de minimis requirement for existing on-site biodiversity features.
Financial benefits	There is the potential for longer term cost savings derived from removal of the existing energy inefficient modular building.

4. Description of site

Blandford St Mary C of E Primary School is located on a constrained site within an established residential area northwest of Birch Avenue.

The site is largely rectangular, with a curved boundary adjacent to Birch Avenue. The access, main school building and surrounding playground areas are found in the southeastern half of the site, with the remaining half of the site to the north and west predominantly laid to playing fields and additional playground hardstanding. To the north of the main school building lies a modular outbuilding, originally a temporary classroom, that is currently used by the Little Birch pre-school with its own access following the northeastern boundary of the school site, again leading from Birch Avenue.

The site is bounded by a combination of metal security fencing, trees and hedgerows.

The main school building has been extended several times since its initial construction following full permission granted in 1994 and, along with the large open space formed by the school playing field, is a prominent feature of the area which is otherwise comprised of dwellings forming the late 20th century housing estate north of the A354.

5. Description of development

The proposal seeks to erect a single storey extension and demolish existing modular building.

6. Background and relevant planning history

2/1989/0812 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 07/04/1993

Develop land for residential purposes and erection of school.

2/1997/0110 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 10/06/1997

Re-site existing mobile classroom to new school site

2/1994/0422 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 22/07/1994

Erect replacement First School, form vehicular access and parking area

2/2001/0544 -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 30/07/2001
Erect extension			
2/2000/0307 -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 21/07/2000
Erect new classroom			
2/2003/0515 -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 25/07/2003
Erect information computer technology/resources/library area			
2/2003/0512 -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 18/08/2003
Erect village hall, form pedestrian and vehicular access and parking area			
2/2005/0191 -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 11/04/2005
Erect 1 no. double mobile classroom			
2/2005/0332 -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 10/05/2005
Install 1 no. free standing double pouch box (to replace single pouch box)			
2/2005/1182 -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 16/01/2006
Erect single storey extensions and a two-storey extension			
2/2005/0906 -	Decision: REF	-	Decision Date: 14/10/2005
Erect single storey extensions and two storey extension			
2/2006/0129 -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 09/03/2006
Erect temporary classroom			
2/2007/0348 -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 05/06/2007
Erect temporary mobile unit for use as a staffroom (Retrospective)			
2/2012/0043/PLNG -	Decision: GRA	-	Decision Date: 06/03/2012
Erect extension to Little Birch Pre-School building.			

7. List of constraints

Within settlement limit; Blandford Forum

Wessex Water Treatment Works Catchment

Wessex Water Risk of foul sewer inundation 2023 High Risk of Foul Sewer Inundation

Dorset Council Land Freehold : Blandford St Mary CE Primary School, School Lane, Blandford St Mary - Reference FH000243

National Landscapes (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty): Dorset; - Distance: 308.59

Ancient Woodland: The Cliff; - Distance: 390.94

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone

8. Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website.

Consultees

1. Blandford St Mary PC

No comments received.

2. –DC Winterborne North Ward

Cllr. Cooper – Welcome the proposed extension.

Representations received

No representations were received for this application.

Total - objections	Total - No objections	Total - comments
0	0	0

Summary of comments of objections: N/A

Summary of comments of support: N/A

9. Duties

s38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of planning applications must be in accordance with the development plan unless material circumstances indicate otherwise.

10. Relevant policies

Development plan

In this case the development plan comprises:

Adopted North Dorset Local Plan:

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

Policy 1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy 4: The natural environment

Policy 14: Social infrastructure

Policy 16: Blandford

Policy 24: Design

Policy 25: Amenity

Made Neighbourhood Plans

Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan (Modified), 2011-2033

Policy B1 – Blandford Forum & Blandford St. Mary Settlement Boundary

Policy B10 – Blandford + Design Code

Material considerations

Emerging local plans:

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant plan policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan are to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

The Dorset Council Local Plan

The Dorset Council Local Plan Options consultation took place between January and March 2021, with further consultation between 18 Aug – 13 October 2025. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the relevant policies in the draft plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision making.

National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended 2025)

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless specific NPPF policies protecting areas or assets provide a strong reason for refusal and/or any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, with particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes.

Other relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4 'Decision making': Para 39 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available...and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
- Section 11 'Making effective use of land'

- Section 12 'Achieving well designed places' This indicates that all development to be of a high quality in design, and the relationship and visual impact of it to be compatible with the surroundings. In particular, and amongst other things, Paragraphs 131 – 141 advise that:

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

- Section 14 'Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change'
- Section 15 'Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment'- Paragraphs 192-195 set out how biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.

Other material considerations

National Planning Practice Guidance

Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidance and Codes including Conservation Area Guides

Code 11. Respect massing, roofscape and height

Code 15. Architectural details, materials and colour palette

Code 17. Building fabric

All of Dorset:

Dorset Council Interim Guidance and Position Statement Appendix B: Adopted Local Plan policies and objectives relating to climate change, renewable energy, and sustainable design and construction. December 2023.

11. Human rights

Article 6 - right to a fair trial.

Article 8 - right to respect for private and family life and home.

The first protocol of Article 1 protection of property.

This recommendation is based on adopted development plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the human rights of the applicant or any third party.

12. Public Sector Equalities Duty

As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have "due regard" to this duty. There are 3 main aims: -

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people

- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove or minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the Public Sector Equalities Duty.

The proposed extension to the school building directly relates to the protected characteristic of age, as it will primarily benefit children and young people. The development seeks to improve the educational facility and accessibility, including for less able persons, thereby helping to remove or minimise disadvantages experienced by younger age groups in accessing suitable learning environments. Furthermore, the extension would support the aim of meeting the specific needs of this age group, which differ from those of the wider population.

13. Public Benefits

The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These are summarised in the table below:

What	Amount / value
Material considerations	
Improved classroom space for Primary School and much improved facilities for existing pre-school.	Non-financial public benefit for users of the school as an improved community facility.
Change to size of playground space within school grounds.	Non-financial benefit – some playground will be lost due to the proposed extension but immediately regained through demolition of the existing modular building, resulting in neutral overall benefit. However, access to the existing playground area behind the demolished building will be improved, providing a more useable open space overall.

14. Planning Assessment

Principle of development

Land was designated for educational use, and this application accords with that continued use.

The demolition of the existing modular building, and erection of single storey extension to main school building, with land on which modular building currently sits to be used as playground, is acceptable, as there is no net loss of play area or playing fields.

The proposal would comply with Policy 14 of the North Dorset Local Plan and NP Policy B1.

Scale, design, impact on character and appearance

The scale of the proposed development accords with the existing school building and earlier extensions on site. The ridge of the proposed pitched roof sits marginally lower than the adjacent pitched roof, with matching slope angle, with the remainder of the proposed extension having a flat roof.

The design has been carefully considered to ensure it accords with the existing building in terms of shape, materiality and overall appearance, ensuring it reflects the character of the existing building. The development proposal would comply with Policy 24 of the North Dorset Local Plan and NP Policy B1.

Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties

The proposed extension will be visible from the rear of the dwellings on the western side of Pigeon Close, with oblique views from Bryanston Court and some other properties on Beckett Close to the north.

It is considered that, given the manner in which the proposed design mirrors and reflects the existing school building, there will be little change to local residents' visual perception of the building, and it is too distant to cause any overlooking concerns or loss of light.

Due to its single-storey stature, demolition of the existing low-level modular building will have a neutral impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties on Pigeon Close. The development proposal would comply with Policy 25 of the North Dorset Local Plan.

Impact on landscape or heritage assets

The site is not within any protected landscape designation, being over 300m outside the boundary of the Dorset National Landscape and almost 400m from an ancient woodland site. It is not within a designated conservation area, and there are no listed buildings within the vicinity.

The proposed extension is designed to remain subservient to the existing school building with materials proposed to blend with the existing structure so it will appear a contiguous part of the existing building. The proposal would comply with Policy 4 and 5 of the North Dorset Local Plan.

Flood risk and drainage

There are no flood risk or drainage issues on the site.

Highway impacts, safety, access and parking

There are no changes proposed to the existing access or parking arrangements, with the proposed new pre-school location still utilising its separate access along the northeastern boundary.

Impact on trees

There are no changes proposed to trees on the site, and there is sufficient access width and existing hardstanding areas to ensure that construction vehicles and equipment will not impact or harm any trees.

Biodiversity

The site of the proposed extension and the existing pre-school site are areas of existing hardstanding. The only biodiversity features within the proposed development area are potted plants that will be removed for the duration of construction works and returned after.

The proposal is exempt from providing biodiversity net gain as it falls below the de minimis requirement for existing on-site biodiversity features.

Financial benefits

Costs savings derived from removal of energy inefficient modular building and replacement with modern insulated extension.

15. Environmental implications

The scheme will offer improved sustainability credentials on site, with the new extension built to current regulations providing a well-insulated space that is more energy efficient with far less heat loss than the current modular building to be demolished.

16. Summary of issues and the planning balance

The scheme to erect an extension to the main school building, providing a new space for the existing pre-school operating on site, and demolition of the existing modular building used by the pre-school complies with the above-mentioned local and national policies and the development plan taken as a whole, with no material planning considerations to indicate that permission should be refused.

17. Recommendation

GRANT, subject to conditions below.

The following conditions are recommended.

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:
4364-01 A Location/Block/Existing Plans
4364-02 A Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

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

3. The external materials to be used for the walls and roof shall be similar in colour and texture to the existing building, in accordance with the materials listed on the 'Application Form' dated 17/06/2025.

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

The following informative notes are recommended.

1. Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for development of land in England is deemed to have

been granted subject to the condition (biodiversity gain condition) that development may not begin unless:

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

(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be Dorset Council.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
- ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
- iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

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

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

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

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

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

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

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

* "original planning permission means the permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions. **Page 21**

3. Informative: National Planning Policy Framework Statement

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

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- offering a pre-application advice service, and
- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this case:

Agenda Item 6

Application Number:	P/FUL/2024/06927
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Land South of Bolney, Salisbury Road, Blandford Forum DT11 7SP
Proposal:	Erect 33 No. dwellings with garages and parking. Form vehicular access from Salisbury Road, associated infrastructure and public open space. Carry out site preparation and ancillary works.
Applicant name:	Lewis Wyatt (Construction) Ltd
Case Officer:	Robert Lennis
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Jespersen, Cllr Lacey-Clarke, Cllr Quayle, Cllr Brown

1. Reason application is going to committee:

Pimperne PC has raised objections to this proposal within twenty-one days of the initial consultation period. These have turned-out to be contrary to the Officer recommendation. As such, in accordance our Constitution this application is being reported to this Planning Committee for a decision.

2. Summary of recommendation:

Grant conditional planning permission subject to the signing of a S106 legal agreement within six months of a committee resolution. If the S106 is not signed within that time period, then the application should be refused unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Head of Planning.

3. Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	There is a conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole as the site would be located outside of the settlement boundary for Blandford and thereby in the countryside (of Pimperne Parish) where development should be resisted unless there is an over-riding need.
Housing land supply (HLS)	The Council's Annual Position Statement of October 2024 is set to expire 31 st October 2025; at which point the Housing Land Supply (HLS) will drop below 5 years with the inspector in the recent Marnhull appeal putting the figure at 2.67years, which would be a shortfall of almost 8,000 homes. At present, the tilted balance is not engaged. However, the substantial uplift in housing requirements remains a significant material consideration.

Issue	Conclusion
Design: access, scale, layout, and appearance	The proposed development is largely two-storey in height. The layout and overall design has followed the Design Code of the approved development to the north and south of the site.
Impact on character of the area	The context of the site, having regard existing and extant development, is that of an urban extension to Blandford. When viewed from any distance it will be seen as part of the surrounding residential developments and would not directly impact any landscape designations.
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	In general amenity terms such as light loss and noise impact, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any seriously detrimental impact subject to design detail.
Impact on landscape or heritage assets	In terms of landscape, this is an infill site as such it will be viewed in the context of existing neighbouring development. The proposal scale of development would not result in a material harm to the landscape character of the area. There are no designated heritage assets within or adjacent to the site, and no intervisibility with non-designated assets.
Flood risk and drainage	Flood Risk Management Team has raised no objections subject to conditions. The site is located within flood zone 1. There are no constraints in terms of flooding or drainage.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	Highway Authority has no objections subject to conditions.
Impact on trees	Trees loss for is necessary to create the new access into the site from Salisbury Road (A354). This would be off-set by new planting across the site as mitigation.
Financial benefits	The applicant is willing to enter into a S106 legal agreement to secure on-site and off-site benefits. This agreement will mirror that of the larger development on a pro-rata basis.

4. Description of site

The site is located to the north-east of Blandford Forum and south-east of the A354 (Salisbury Road). The bulk of the site made-up from former residential garden land (annexed from the dwelling Bolney) and an agricultural field located to the south-east (which appears to have been a part of the Bolney estate) is within Pimperne Parish. The remainder of the site which would accommodate the propose round-about and some proposed road works lies within Blandford Forum Parish. The site area is approximately 2ha.

The site forms an infill parcel (now in control of the applicant) within a wider land holding which has recently had planning permission approved (P/OUT/2020/00026, also known as Blandford Parklands) for a residential led (490 homes) mixed use development proposal by the applicant.

The site is currently accessible to vehicles from the A354 (Salisbury Road) by way of an existing access to Bolney which spurs into the site. This access will be retained to serve Bolney, and a new access off a new roundabout on the A354 (Salisbury Road) is proposed to serve the development.

The former garden area has some mature trees and landscaping including a disused tennis court, and the application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement which takes account of these features.

The site is within the setting of the nearby Cranborne Chase National Landscape (154m away). The site's topography slopes down and away to the southeast Pimperne Brooke (a tributary of the River Stour) is located c.400 metres to the southeast, and the site lies entirely within flood zone 1.

5. Description of development

The application seeks full planning permission for the erections of 33 dwellings with associated garages and parking, the creation of access (round-about) off Salisbury Road, provision of infrastructure, public open space, and ancillary works.

The residential element would deliver 23no. open market dwellings and 10no. affordable homes. The mix of dwelling types would be: 12no. (36%) apartments and flats above garages, 6no. (18%) semi-detached houses, and 15no. (46%) detached houses.

Of this total, 10 dwellings (30%) would be provided as affordable, comprising a mix of affordable rent and shared ownership dwellings; 60% would be 1-2 bed dwellings and 40% would be 3+ bedroom houses. Affordable homes would be spread across the development area and designed to be tenure blind.

The proposed roundabout would link with the wider development of Blandford Parklands creating easier linkages to the approved local centre and its services on the opposite side of the A354 and the wider community. The proposals also intend to deliver a new avenue street connection to Salisbury Road, forming a primary access point for Blandford Parklands. The avenue would be designed with widened verges, significant tree planting which would reinforce the parkland characteristics. Midway along the avenue would be a pocket of open space, focused around existing feature trees, and landscaped to offer an accessible green for all to enjoy.

The bus access/egress approved as part of the of the Parklands development would no longer be necessary. As such this proposal, would be able to provide a positive frontage to the woodland edge to Letton Park, where a green corridor route will form part of a wider network of footpaths to connect residents with the Parkland open spaces and community facilities.

6. Background and relevant planning history

P/OUT/2020/00026 - Decision: Granted - Decision Date: 05/08/2024

Hybrid planning application for the phased development for up to 490 No. dwellings and non-residential uses comprising:

Outline planning application (to determine access) to develop land by the erection of up to 340 No. dwellings (Use Class B2) local centre with flexible floorspace

including Commercial, Business and Services (Use Class E), Drinking Establishments and hot food takeaways (Use Class Sui Generis) and Local Community (Use Class F2); land for a three-form entry primary school and associated playing pitches (Use Class F1 Learning and non-residential institutions); form public open space, replacement allotments including allotment building, new sports pitches, parking, access, infrastructure, landscaping, and carry out ancillary and site preparation works, including demolition of existing buildings and removal of existing allotments.

Full planning application to erect 150 No. dwellings (Use Class C3), form public open space, attenuation basins, parking, access, infrastructure, landscaping, and carry out ancillary and site preparation works.

7. List of constraints

Tree Preservation Order ref: TPO/2023/0004, this is an area TPO covering the Bolney estate as was.

Cranborne Chase National Landscape (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)

8. Consultations

(All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website [Planning application: P/FUL/2024/06927 - dorsetforyou.com](https://www.dorsetforyou.com/Planning/P/FUL/2024/06927).)

Natural England - no objection subject to securing mitigation.

Cranborne Chase National Landscape – has raised the following concerns/objections:

- Urban incursion into a farmed landscape and there will be extensive area of roofs that will feature in views from public access areas east and southeast of the site within this National Landscape
- Reduction of the Open Gap contrary to Policy LC(g)
- Concerns surrounding external lighting and street lighting in this location
- Lack of clarity where any public open space would be located
- The submitted visuals do not show the inclusion of any renewable energy schemes but the supporting sustainability page in the D&AS shows a roof with solar panels which could lead readers to believe solar panels would be included

DC Natural Environment Team – no objection subject to conditions.

DC Trees – raised concerns with the cumulative loss of trees

DC Highways – no objections subject to condition.

DC Flood Risk Management – no objection subject to conditions.

DC Housing Enabling Team – no objection subject to securing and appropriate tenure mix.

DC CIL and Section 106 – no objection subject to securing contributions as set out in Policies 13, 14, and 15 of the adopted NDLPP1.

DC Senior Archaeologist – no objections.

Blandford Forum TC – support

- the Town Council would give its full support to this proposed application.

Pimperne PC - object

- Impact of the proposed roundabout on the local road network & concerns about the proposed link between this development and the adjacent development becoming a 'rat-run' from the A354 through to the bypass to circumvent queuing traffic
- Questions on the supporting highways data and that it fails to demonstrate that the development could be accommodated safely and without undue driver frustration and delays
- Cumulative amount and location of the development which conflicts the Neighbourhood Plan and isn't following a 'plan-led' system
- Significant adverse impact on the setting of the Cranborne Chase National Landscape and the defined Important Open Gap (set out in the Neighbourhood Plan). Phases 3 and 4 of the adjoining development have yet to receive reserved matters approval so it is not currently known what the full impact on the Open Gap would be cumulatively between this development and the future phases of the adjoining development.
- Need to redress the loss of tree cover/habitat that was removed prior to this application – the habitats information doesn't accurately reflect this
- Matters of detailed design
 - The Neighbourhood Plan specifies a proportion of homes should be suitable for residents with more limited mobility but no evidence has been provided on compliance with this
 - Concerns surrounding street lighting and impact on National Landscape
- Affordable Housing level falls short of policy compliant level of 40% and the affordable units are located closest to Salisbury Road
- Noise concerns to proposed dwelling from A354
- Policy conflicts as the Council can currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing
- Overreliance on in-line parking

Representations received

CPRE - raised concerns/objections relating to policy, dark skies, highway safety, and accuracy of information relating to the new school.

MoreBus - support

- The proposed access to Salisbury Road resolves a missing link within the vehicular access and movement strategy for the allocation
- The link also provides a surveilled pedestrian cycle and vehicular circulation from the bulk of the development to the proposed local centre and primary school that is north of Salisbury Road

- The proposal would contribute to the housing land supply position and provide affordable housing

18 representations have been received raising concerns or objections

Summary of Comments:

- Highways safety & additional traffic – traffic surveys submitted are not reflective of the actual traffic levels
- Over development considering current infrastructure
- Increased crime & rubbish
- Increased noise & light pollution detrimental to the environment
- Impact to National Landscape
- The development would not be in-keeping with the surrounding area
- The bat survey refers to out of date policies
- Segregation of affordable homes from market homes
- Affordable homes need to be affordable and for local people (as set out in Neighbourhood Plan)
- Designate pedestrian crossing points at the proposed new roundabout to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety especially for the current cycleway/footpath along Salisbury Road
- No mention of additional drainage at new roundabout – current surface water issues at this location
- Will the interior roads be wide enough for buses to navigate without cars parking on the pavement

9. Duties

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, S38(6), requires that the determination of planning applications must be in accordance with the development plan unless material circumstances indicate otherwise.

Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000), clause 85, states that on land in an AONB that Local Planning Authorities must seek to further, and shall have regard to, the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the National Landscape (formerly known as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty(AONB))

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990- section 66 includes a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 – a relevant local planning authority has a 'duty to grant planning permission etc'. This means that the Council must give suitable development permission to enough suitable serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in their area based on our register during a base period

10. Most Relevant Policies

The Development Plan

Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan (B+NP)

The original version of the Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan was made (adopted) on 22 June 2021. The plan has been reviewed and the Modified Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan was made (adopted) by Dorset Council on 3 October 2023.

- Policy B1- Blandford Forum & Blandford St. Mary Settlement Boundary defines the settlement boundary for Blandford Forum.
- Policy B2 - Land to the North and North East of Blandford Forum allocates land for a mix of residential, education, community and allotment uses subject to specified criteria (i-xiii). As an urban extension to Blandford it seeks 30% affordable housing in line with LPP1 Policy 8(b).

Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan (PNP) –

The original version of the Pimperne Neighbourhood plan was made (adopted) on the 25 January 2019. The plan has been reviewed and the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan Review was made (adopted) on 1 November 2022.

- Policy SB: Settlement Boundary defines the settlement boundary for the village of Pimperne. Development outside of this boundary will be treated as 'countryside' in respect of the Local Plan Policies.
- Policy LC: Landscape Character is a policy made up of nine criteria (a-i). These set out, amongst other relevant matters, that all new development must take account of the relevant AONB management plan (Cranbourne Chase in this instance) and not detract from the special qualities.
- Policy MHN: Meeting Housing Need is a policy made up of five criteria (a-e); this policy sets out a housing target of at least 61 dwellings to meet the projected needs of Pimperne with sites to be located within or adjacent to the settlement boundary of Pimperne village and to provide 40% affordable housing on sites of five or more.

North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) adopted January 2016:

- Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy 2: Core Spatial Strategy
- Policy 3: Climate Change
- Policy 4: The Natural Environment
- Policy 5: The Historic Environment
- Policy 6: Housing Distribution
- Policy 7: Delivering Homes
- Policy 8: Affordable Housing
- Policy 13: Grey Infrastructure
- Policy 14: Social Infrastructure
- Policy 15: Green Infrastructure
- Policy 16: Blandford
- Policy 20: The Countryside
- Policy 22: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy
- Policy 23: Parking
- Policy 24: Design
- Policy 25: Amenity

North Dorset District Wide Local Plan (1st Revision) Adopted 2003:

- Policy 1.16 – Groundwater Source Protection

Material considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended 2025)

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development as follows:

- Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development...

For decision-taking this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date (fn8), granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination(fn9).

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant plan policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan are to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

Annual Position Statement (Housing land supply and Housing Delivery Test)

On the 26th September 2024, The Planning Inspectorate issued the Inspector's report confirming the Council's Annual Position Statement (APS). The APS confirms that the whole of the Dorset Council area can demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing of 5.02 years, and that this figure is fixed until 31 October 2025 in accordance with paragraph 233 of the NPPF. An updated APS that reflects the Inspector's findings is available on the Council's website.

Planning appeals:

- Appeal ref: APP/D1265/W/24/3353912, Land West of Church Hill and Land Off Butts Close and Schoolhouse Lane, Marnhull, Dorset. (Decision date 6 May 2025)
 - o It is noteworthy that the Inspector found at paragraph 53 "...*The Local Plan is self-evidently not designed to address currently identified housing need. The serious picture of overall housing need, the absence of a relevant and up to date strategy for housing provision and distribution to deal with that need, and the housing supply position the Council will be in*

very shortly when the annual position statement on housing land supply expires, are material considerations of the highest importance.”

- Appeal ref: APP/D1265/W/24/3351896, Land North of Ward's Drove, Blandford St Mary (Decision date 21 May 2025)
 - o The Inspector opined at paragraph 27 “As for furthering the purpose of the CCNL, ...It is logical to conclude that, if the NDP’s minimum housing requirement is not met here, other sites will come forward which could harm the setting and thus the purpose of the CCNL. Delivering needed housing in a location ... appropriate to do so within the setting of the CCNL will minimise the effects of housing delivery in the area, and thus further the CCNL’s purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area.”.

Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guidance

- Paragraphs 86, 100, 104, 107, 116, 129

Cranbourne Chase AONB Management Plan

Policy PT 14 - Development proposals in the AONB or its setting should demonstrate how they have taken account of the AONB Management Plan objectives and policies.

Policy PT15 – Local Planning Authority partners ensure that where new development is permitted, it complements the special qualities of the AONB (i.e. the tranquil unspoilt qualities of the area, wide expansive skies, rich land use history, local vernacular building styles and strong sense of place) and takes full account of the area’s setting and context through the consideration of appropriate Landscape Character Assessments and sensitivity and design studies.

CC AONB Landscape Character Assessment (2003)

(emerging) Dorset Council Local Plan

The emerging Dorset Council Local Plan is out to consultation until 13 October 2025. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the relevant policies in the draft plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision-making.

With regard to this proposed development site, it is considered to be consistent with the existing spatial strategy, i.e. Blandford is a sustainable location for growth. Further, the emerging LP is putting forward the idea of having ‘flexible settlement’ boundaries for selected towns and villages.

11. Human rights

Article 6 - right to a fair trial.

Article 8 - right to respect for private and family life and home.

The first protocol of Article 1 protection of property.

This recommendation is based on adopted development plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the human rights of the applicant or any third party.

12. Public Sector Equalities Duty

As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have “due regard” to this duty. There are 3 main aims: -

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people
- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove or minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the Public Sector Equalities Duty. In particular,

- Provisions will be made for level access to buildings, ensuring that people with mobility impairments are not disadvantaged.
- Dropped kerbs at corner locations, and at key crossing points to facilitate safe and convenient movement for wheelchair users, those with visual impairments, and people pushing prams. Easier and better access to the primary school site.
- The scheme includes a proportion of homes designed to meet M4(2) adaptable standards, which exceed minimum Building Regulations and provide flexibility for residents with changing mobility needs. This supports the objective of meeting the needs of people with disabilities and older persons.

13. Benefits

In order to make development acceptable in planning terms, applications for major housing development are expected to maintain and enhance the level of grey, green & social infrastructure as set out in Policies 13, 14 and 15 of the LPP1.

The applicant and officers are working to complete the S106 legal agreement. This would secure, as a minimum, the following contributions and obligations:

- Affordable housing – 30% on-site provision
- NHS Infrastructure Contribution - £722 per dwelling
- Education (primary and secondary) - £6,094.34 per (qualifying) dwelling
- Education (SEN provision) - £1,487.62 per (qualifying) dwelling
- Pre-school provision - £190.50 per (qualifying) dwelling
- Informal open space – on site provision
- Informal open space maintenance contribution - £1,278.80 per dwelling
- LAP - on site provision
- LAP maintenance contribution £359.36 per dwelling
- Formal Outdoor Sports Facilities maintenance contribution - £128.73 per dwelling
- Library contribution - £252 per dwelling

14. Sustainability and Climate Change Statement

The applicant has submitted a comprehensive Statement which response positively to Dorset Council’s Sustainability Checklist (December 2023).

Amongst other relevant matters they inform us that there would be:

- *The fabric first approach to the proposed development will maximise energy efficiency and will be combined with renewable and low carbon technologies (e.g. photovoltaics (PV) and air source heat pumps), with each home to be 'Zero Carbon Ready' and fully compliant with emerging 2025 building regulations and the scrapping of gas boilers...*
- *As far as operationally possible onsite renewable energy generation will provide energy to each home, making best use of solar PV and air source heat pumps to each dwelling. Homes will be built to the emerging 'Zero Carbon Ready' future homes standard due to be introduced in 2025/26...*
- *...Embodied carbon emissions have been considered. Homes will be built to a high standard using quality materials to stand the test of time. Locally sourced building materials will be used where possible...*
- *Measures to conserve water through rainwater include rainwater harvesting...*
- *The drainage strategy has been designed to complementarily link with the wider Sustainable Urban Drainage systems and overall surface and foul drainage strategies for permission P/OUT/2020/00026 (adjoining site).*
- *Specific proposed climate change adaptation measures in the construction and operational phases include, but are not limited to, fabric specification, heat recovery technologies, solar PV panels, solar thermal panels, air source heat pumps and the resultant energy savings...Strategic planting can help to reduce heat stress by providing cooling and shading, as acknowledged in Dorset Council's Climate and Ecological Emergency Strategy.*

15. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

The proposed development is not considered to meet the thresholds requiring an Environmental Statement (ES). A technical note has been provided which assessed whether the proposal constitutes 'EIA development' under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended), taking into account the relevant legal thresholds, policy guidance, and potential for cumulative or exceptional environmental effects.

The site is not located within a sensitive area as defined by Regulation 2(1) of the EIA Regulations and does not exceed 5 hectares. The proposed development does not comprise more than one hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development and nor does it seek to build more than 150 residential units. Therefore, it does not trigger Category 10 of Schedule 2, 'Infrastructure', sub section (b).

The proposed development has also been reviewed against each of the four exceptional circumstances set out within the EIA Regulations and is considered to not trigger the need for EIA against those circumstances. As such, it is considered that the proposed development is not EIA development.

16. Planning Assessment

The main issues of this case are considered to relate to:

- Spatial strategy and the principle of development
- Site location and infill development
- Housing Land Supply and Housing Delivery Test
- Affordable housing and housing mix
- Design, applying the approved Design Code of Blandford Parklands

- Access and movement
- Layout
- Scale
- Appearance and materials
- Landscape matters
- Residential amenities
- Flood risk and drainage
- Ecology
- Planning balance.

Spatial Strategy and the Principle of Development

Members should be aware that in a recent planning appeal (ref: APP/D1265/W/24/3353912, Marnhull) the Planning Inspectorate has found that our Local Plan is “self-evidently” not designed to address currently identified housing need. While the general principle of concentrating the largest amount of growth in the main town remains valid, the Plan’s policies for the delivery of housing, including its spatial strategy and the amounts of development to be allocated to different locations, now carries little weight. That said, planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise

The core spatial strategy of the development plan (LPP1 Policy 2) identifies Blandford (Forum and St Mary), Gillingham, Shaftesbury and Sturminster Newton as the key strategic settlements and seeks to focus the vast majority of the District’s growth in these main towns as they are the most sustainable locations where homes, jobs and facilities are easily accessible.

The bulk of the proposed development site would sit within Pimperne CP. The Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan has not allocated this portion of the site for housing. It lies outside of their designated settlement boundary, and the settlement boundary of Blandford, and is therefore considered as part of the countryside under PNP Policy SB: Settlement Boundary.

PNP Policy MHN: Meeting Housing Need was written to address the local needs of the community and never intended to address the strategic need of the district (as was North Dorset DC) or the strategic need of the emerging Dorset Local Plan. Nonetheless, the proposal conflicts with Criteria b) which states that homes should be located to the west side of the A354 main road on land within or adjacent to the settlement boundary of Pimperne. There is also a conflict with Policy MHN c) ‘to resist development in the countryside’. However, the policy route for assessment goes through PNP Policy SB: Settlement Boundary which states that development outside of the new settlement boundary will be treated as ‘countryside’ in respect of the Local Plan policies (i.e. LPP1 Policies 2, 6, and 20).

LPP1 Policy 2 (Core Spatial Strategy) states that all development should be located in accordance with the spatial strategy for North Dorset. It highlights Blandford as one of the four main towns which will function as the main service centres with employment opportunities. These towns have the best range of sustainable transport options and the greatest potential for further sustainable transport improvements. They are the main focus for growth, both for the vast majority of housing and other development. However, that policy also highlights that outside of the defined boundaries of the four main towns, Stalbridge and the larger villages, the remainder of the district will be subject to countryside policies where development will be strictly controlled unless it is required to enable essential

rural needs to be met. It goes on to state that at Stalbridge and all the District's villages (including Pimperne) the focus will be on meeting local (rather than strategic) needs.

Policy 6 of the Local Plan relates to housing distribution and amongst other things states that in the countryside (including Stalbridge and the villages) the level of housing and affordable housing provision will be the cumulative number of new homes delivered to contribute towards meeting identified local and essential rural needs. There is an "at least" figure of 825 dwellings written into the Policy. However, this figure has been exceeded many times over and particularly on appeals where Planning Inspectors have found development to be in a sustainable location.

Policy 20 of the Local Plan sets out that development in the countryside outside defined settlement boundaries will only be permitted if it is of a type appropriate in the countryside (as listed, providing rural needs), or for any other type of development, it can be demonstrated that there is an 'overriding need' for it to be located in the countryside.

The application site, being located outside of the defined settlement boundary and not fulfilling any of the criteria for being a type appropriate in the countryside under policy 20, would conflict with Policies 2, 6 and 20 of the LPP1 and the PNP Policy SB unless there was an 'overriding need'.

With regard to the Blandford + NP, Policy B2 has allocated the part of the land within its' jurisdiction for a mixed used development including residential, education, community and allotments. In respect of the land within the Blandford + NP area, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable.

Site location and infilling

In light of LPP1 and the PNP policies, the proposed development site is in a countryside location where development is to be resisted unless there is an overriding need. However, to the southwest is a large residential dwelling (Greenbanks), to the northeast is a large residential dwelling (Bolney), to the northwest there is the extant permission (ref: P/OUT/2020/00026 Blandford Parklands) for a new local centre and dwellings and the existing housing in Letton Close, and to the southeast there is the extant permission of Blandford Parklands for housing and public open spaces. Therefore, it must be acknowledged that on the ground, and having regard to extant permissions, the character of the area which surrounds and influences this site is no longer countryside. Hence, it is considered that this proposal is best described as infill development that will be greatly influenced by surrounding development.

Housing Land Supply and Housing Delivery Test

The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) confirmed in September 2024 that Dorset Council's Annual Position Statement could demonstrate a Housing Land Supply (HLS) of 5.02 years. This covers the entire Dorset Council area and replaces all previous calculations for the former districts. We are entitled to rely on this position until 31 October 2025. Furthermore, no areas in the Council have a Housing Delivery Test result of less than 75%. This means that the presumption in favour of sustainable development (the tilted balance) does not apply and full weight can be given to relevant policies in the adopted Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans.

However, the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) has changed the method for calculating 'local housing need' (LHN) which is the target of every Council's HLS. Applying this new method of calculating LHN Dorset Council will have a shortfall of almost 8,000 homes on the 1st November 2025 (previously we calculated our local housing need on 1,793 x 5 years, this will increase to 3,219 x 5 years). Whilst we are seeking to address this LHN through the emerging Dorset Local Plan, it will not be until sometime in 2027 that the emerging Plan is adopted. Applicants should note, the potential sites needed

to meet this demand have not yet been selected and the public consultation to identify them does not finish until 13th October 2025.

As observed by inspectors in recent appeals, our overall housing need and the absence of a relevant and up to date strategy for housing provision and distribution are material considerations of the highest importance. It is therefore considered that the imminent shortfall in housing land supply is a significant material consideration that weighs in favour of the development in this particular case.

Affordable Housing and Self-build/Custom Houses

We are informed by our Housing Enabling Officer that there are over 7500 households on the Dorset Council housing register; of those 382 have declared a connection to Blandford and a further 827 households have listed Blandford as a preferred area. This adds to the seriousness of our housing land supply and delivery.

Policy 8 of the NDLP relates to affordable housing. For Blandford, the policy requires that within the settlement boundary of Blandford (Forum and St. Mary) and within any urban extensions to the town, 30% of the total number of dwellings should be affordable. The PNP has a requirement for 40% affordable housing and this reflects the policy requirement in the countryside under the NDLP. However, the location of the development adjacent to the settlement of Blandford means that it will function as an urban extension to the town.

This site will be developed by the applicant as part of their extant permission for an urban extension to Blandford Forum. It proposes 33no. dwellings as an infill parcel. Of these, the applicant is proposing to deliver 30% or 10no. dwellings. This is the same percentage secured in the extant permission and is compliant with LPP1 Policy 8 which states that within any urban extensions to Blandford 30% of the total will be affordable.

The mix of these would be 2x1b flats, 2x2b flats, 2x3b flats and 4x3b houses. Whilst there may be a preference for 1 bedroom dwellings in the affordable rent, the provision of two apartments to address this need is not objectionable. Larger family accommodation is met with 2no. 2-bedroom apartments and 6no. 3-bedroom dwellings (2 apartments and 4 houses). Taken in the wider context of the affordable housing delivery that will be provided across the wider site allocation it is considered this is an entirely appropriate affordable housing provision for this application.

The applicant is agreeable to our request for a policy compliant mix of 70% rented and 30% intermediate housing. Based on the current level of affordable housing 7 dwellings will be affordable rent with the remaining 3 as intermediate housing. These would be secured via an S106 agreement.

The Blandford + NP Policy B2 seeks a 5% self-build/custom build provision on a residential scheme of approximately 400 dwellings in the Blandford + NP area allocation. This would equate to approximately 20 plots. The extant permission across the wider site secured consent for 490 dwellings, some of which fell beyond the Blandford + NP area. Notwithstanding this, Wyatt Homes agreed to a 5% requirement across the whole site rather than the dwellings that solely fell within the Blandford + NP Plan area. This would mean some 24 self-build/custom build plots will be provided and therefore an over-provision against what the policy envisaged securing is already being made. With this overprovision in mind on the wider site and given that the housing on this site, does not actually fall in the Blandford + NP area it is considered that this requirement is not necessary in policy terms.

On the matter of adaptability and flexible homes suitable for residents with more limited mobility. Proposed house type HA1006 is an M4(2) adaptable compliant home and meets the Building Regulation Requirements. There are 4 of these proposed and the scheme is therefore providing more than 10% of the homes as M4(2). The Morden house type is also capable of meeting M4(2) requirements. Therefore with these additional 3 dwellings the

scheme would provide over 20% towards the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan Policy MHN requirement.

Design, applying the approved Design Code of Blandford Parklands

This is a full application. As such, detailed plans have been submitted which show the access, layout, scale, and appearance of the development. Illustrative plans of landscaping have been submitted which show sufficient detail to allow for this matter to be conditioned if members were minded to approve this application.

The Design Code principles for Blandford Parklands have been extended to incorporate the application site. For this application, three of the four frontage character typologies, each with design guidance informing the proposed layout response: continuous, regular, and stepped. These, in turn, come with design guidance informing the proposed layout response. The compliance of the proposals to the Design Code guidance is highlighted throughout the submitted Design and Access Statement. Members may recall that the Design Code for Parklands was the subject of a bespoke condition of approval. As this is a full application, there is confidence that the development would comply with the principles of the Design Code that was secured for the outline portion of the adjacent application site.

Access and movement

Vehicular access to the development site is proposed from the southern arm of a new four-arm compact roundabout on the A354 (Salisbury Road). This would replace the simple priority junction agreed in connection with the extant permission. The fourth arm of the roundabout would provide access to the northern parcel (and local centre) also permitted by extant permission (ref: P/OUT/2020/00026). This accords with B+NP Policy B2(vi) and is considered to be an improvement to the extant scheme broadly speaking.

The roundabout would act as a traffic calming feature, reducing the speed of vehicles approaching and exiting the roundabout.

For pedestrians, the roundabout would have uncontrolled crossing points on all arms of the roundabout. This would improve the connectivity between the southern parcel and the northern parcel crossing the A354 (Salisbury Road), by providing easier and better access to the primary school, open space, and the approved local centre planned for the northern parcel of land.

The proposed development has purposefully been designed such that the spine road would extend directly into the extant permission to the southeast; in the vicinity of the junction with Plots 14 and 22. This would provide a continuous 6.7m wide carriageway, which would facilitate two-way buses through both development sites. It is noted above that the bus service provider is support of this scheme. It is also worth noting that your highway engineers (Local Highway Authority) have no objection to the proposal subject to conditions.

Layout

The layout is primarily organised around a central tree lined avenue connecting Salisbury Road with Parklands. A positive sense of arrival would be created by landscaping and additional tree planting and having building frontages that relate in form and appearance with neighbouring properties. Perimeter blocks are employed to create enclosure, secure boundaries, and enable positive building frontages with passive surveillance of surrounding streets and spaces. A clear definition between public and private realm is also established through the proposed block structure.

Scale

The site is proposed to accommodate 33 dwellings, comprising of a mixture of 21 houses and 12 apartments. The design, scale and density of the development has been informed by the design code submitted in support of the wider development, to ensure that the two applications are wholly compatible.

All proposed housing would be two-storeys in height, forming an extension of the 'Parkland' character area of the extant permission. All houses would be contained within a maximum roof ridge height parameter of 10.5 metres from existing ground level. This accords with the height parameter zone established through the recently approved Blandford Parklands proposals.

The two-storey apartment building adjacent to neighbouring house Bolney would be 8.6 metres to roof ridge from the finished floor level of the building. The existing ground level slopes in this location, and the access relationship to the proposed street would result in a maximum roof ridge height parameter of 12 metres from the existing ground level. This also accords with the established height parameter zone for the adjoining Blandford Parklands proposals particularly the Salisbury Road frontage of the approved local centre on the opposite side of the A354.

Appearance and materials

The appearance of the proposed dwellings has been kept simple but several architectural details have been incorporated to add interest and variety throughout the scheme. This includes chimneys located on the gable ends and finished off with clay pots. Casement windows, simple box sash, and brickwork are proposed as they are commonly found on in the Dorset vernacular.

The materials proposed will reflect the 'Materials and Details palette' and character are specification defined within the Design Code to ensure an integrated character and identity. The palette does not prescribe a particular architectural style but is reflective in colour and materials to this locality. This simple approach will present a clear and coherent appearance. It is considered that the proposal would comply with Policy 24 of the NDLP.

Landscape matters

With regard to national landscape designations, the NPPF states that development *within* their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas. The proposed development site is within the setting of the Cranbourne Chase National Landscape. But, it is not covered by any statutory landscape designations (either nationally or locally), and it is not considered to be a valued landscape.

Because of the infill nature of this site, it is considered that the proposed development would have a negligible impact in terms of landscape. This is because to the north, any intervisibility with the CCNL would be screened by the existing dwellings of Letton Close and the extant development of a local centre and housing. While to the south, views of the site from the CCNL would be seen in the context of residential development already permitted and the existing residential properties to the east and west. As such, the proposed development would be sensitively located.

With regard to the development plan Policy LC: Landscape Character of the PNP sets out criteria a-i for development within the parish boundaries to be measured against. This policy is in conformity with the Development Plan, particularly LPP1 Policy 4 – The Natural Environment. It also has regard to the CC AONB Management Plan.

The relevant criteria of Policy LC are considered here:

a) All new development within the plan area must demonstrate that account has been taken of the relevant AONB Management Plan policies and must not detract from the special qualities of the Cranborne Chase and Dorset AONBs unless, in the case of major development, this is justified by exceptional circumstances and it is clearly in the public interest to permit the development.

The first test of this criterion is 'has the applicant demonstrated that account has been taken of the CC AONB Management Plan' and the second test is 'the proposed development must not detract from the special qualities of the CC AONB'. If these tests are passed, then one should move onto the next criteria. If these tests are not passed, then one should consider whether there are 'exceptional circumstances' and whether it is clearly in the public interest to permit the development.

The applicant's Design & Access Statement (September 2024) sets out under the section titled 'Site & Context' a thorough understanding of local landscape and how the design has taken account of the CC AONB special qualities.

b) Development in the countryside should avoid higher ground and open vistas where it is likely to be prominent in wider views. Where development in such locations cannot be avoided, the following mitigation should be applied

- materials should be muted colours found in the traditional agricultural buildings of the area*
- buildings should be designed to have a low profile, avoid creating large unbroken blocks, and to use the landform, siting and orientation to reduce landscape impact*
- existing tree cover, hedgerows and/or new landscaping should be used to minimise any remaining adverse impacts to an acceptable level.*

As stated above this infill site will be seen the context of the other residential development. The proposed scale of buildings would be no higher than two-storey. It is clear from the street scene plans that the proposed development, in and of itself, would not be prominent in the wider views of the site.

The loss of some trees will be required to put in the roundabout, but mitigation in the form of replanting trees nearby and throughout this site would reduce the landscape impact. In particular, the retention of trees elsewhere on the site will benefit the proposal's ability to settle visually.

Reading through the applicant's Design and Access Statement, the design and materials will follow the Blandford Parklands high quality ethos. The suggested palate of locally distinctive materials was previously considered to be acceptable and that would still be the case for this development site.

c) All woodlands should be protected and managed to sustain them in the long term, or where their loss cannot be avoided suitable replacement woodland planting that will provide a similar landscape and wildlife benefit should be secured.

The proposed site is not considered to be woodland, nor would its development directly affect any woodlands.

With reference to the TPO on site, the old garden of Bolney benefits from a prodigious amount of trees many of which are covered by a tree preservation order. As such, the proposed development has been shaped to some extent by the distribution of existing trees on site. While the proposal requires the removal of some thirteen trees, these are all classified as low quality and, or, unhealthy trees. Most of the protect trees are retained and will help to provide a silvan backdrop to the proposed development. Significant boundary tree cover would remain intact and no medium or high-quality trees are intended to be removed. There are no incursions into RPAs of important retained trees.

Members should be aware that the proposal includes a comprehensive landscaping proposal that would mitigate any losses and limit the impact on local character to the short term and in the immediate vicinity. In the context of this site, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact to local character or the wider setting.

d) Within Pimperne village, ...

The proposed development is not within Pimperne village. Therefore, this is not relevant.

e) Street lighting and flood lights should be avoided as generally inappropriate, having due regard to the significance of the expanse of dark night skies for the AONB. Where these cannot be avoided, they should be designed in accordance with the guidance set out in the Cranborne AONB Position Statement Number 1 on Light Pollution and Good Practice Note 7 - Good External Lighting and International Dark Sky Reserve criteria.

Cranborne Chase NL comments suggest that the street lighting proposed is not future proofed to IDSR guidelines. However, it is considered that the proposed lighting strategy adopts and follows the same lighting principles that have been accepted and agreed for the wider development site under planning permission P/OUT/2020/00026 taking into account the Dark Skies advice note set out by the Cranborne Chase NL, in respect of light colour (3000K or less) as well as lamp design, light direction and shielding of perimeter lighting to the edge of the site. It is noted that the application does not include plans for domestic lighting.

The applicant has confirmed their willingness to agree to a proposed condition similar to condition 30 of planning permission P/OUT/2020/00026 requiring the submission of a lighting strategy to agree these details that reflects the need to avoid harm to protected species and to minimise light spill.

f) Where development is appropriate on the edge of a settlement, it should incorporate suitable landscaping to avoid creating a hard and visually prominent edge. On higher / open ground the mitigation measures in (b) should also be applied.

Not relevant.

g) "Development should not harm the views of Pimperne village as appreciated on the approach from the south along the A354, or reduce the open nature of the gap between Blandford Forum and the village of Pimperne, as indicated on Map 2, and should respect the treed and distinctive character of Letton Park within this gap."

There are two parts to criteria g). The first part relates to the approach to the village from Blandford along the A354 (Salisbury Road). The views along this road includes trees and hedges, domestic clap-board fencing, dwellings of various sizes and setbacks to the road, and driveways/access arrangements.

The proposed roundabout would result in the loss of hedging and some trees. In the short term, the appearance of a new roundabout would be a significant change. However, in the medium to long term a high quality landscaping scheme would mitigate and soften the appearance. It is considered that the proposal would cause some degree of harm to the approach from the south along the A354, but this would be limited and contained.

The infill nature of this site is such that it would not have an appreciable impact on the open nature of the gap between Blandford Forum and the village of Pimperne.

The location of the proposed roundabout is considered to be a respectful distance from Letton Park to adequately avoid any harm to its distinctive character.

h) ... character of Nutford ...

Not relevant.

i) Development should respect the historic character of the landscape, including archaeological features that are clearly evident within the landform (many of which are recorded in the Dorset Historic Environment Record).

The Council's Senior Archaeologist is satisfied with the submitted archaeological evaluation of the site and has no objection.

It is considered that the proposal would comply with Policy LC: Landscape Character of the PNP overall and Policy 4 of the NDLP.

Residential amenities

The proposed layout and subsequent spacing between existing and new dwellings are considered to be sufficient to avoid any seriously detrimental impact on the amenities of existing and future residents.

The application was also supported by an acoustic report. This provided a Stage 1 assessment which shows that the daytime and night-time noise levels at the proposed building façade locations can be considered medium to high risk, where the highest risk is found toward Salisbury Road. An Acoustic Design Statement, outlining appropriate measures to mitigate noise impacts has been prepared, based on the proposed layout to demonstrate the residential suitability of the design in relation to noise. Mitigation measures including façade acoustic performance requirements have been recommended. These are matters that will be addressed by building regulations. The proposal would comply with Policy 25 of the NDLP.

Flood risk and drainage

The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 and it is not considered to be at any significant risk of surface water flooding. The application site is also not considered to be at risk of groundwater flooding. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development is compatible with the flood risk to the site.

In terms of drainage, the submitted Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy sets out that ground investigations did not support the widescale use of infiltration as a means of disposal of surface water at the site. Instead, the Applicant proposed to discharge surface water to an attenuation basin labelled 'pond 2' which is located outside of the redline boundary of this application but is in the applicant's control and forms part of consented development P/OUT/2020/00026. Written approval from the landowner was submitted with this application to confirm that future surface water drainage from the site could be discharged to this basin. Overall, the Local Lead Flood Authority, who were consulted on this application, considered that the proposed method of surface water disposal would be acceptable subject to conditions attached to the decision, if this application is approved.

Ecology

Your Natural Environment Team has identified that the site forms a small part of a Higher Potential Ecological Network area. Higher Potential Ecological Network areas are comprised of areas that are not yet part of the functioning network, but which could contribute in the future. They may also be the areas which have the potential for future restoration work or to improve connectivity.

With this in mind:

- The northern part of the site comprises a residential garden and the southern part of the site forms part of a wider intensively farmed arable field. These habitats are of very limited nature conservation interest in their own right, and in the absence of development the current land use is highly unlikely to change.
- The proposed development includes habitats of wildlife value wherever possible. This includes a substantial 48.85% net gain in linear habitats and inclusion of habitats such as species rich grassland and native scrub in the landscape scheme. The value of the site for wildlife would be further enhanced through provision of bat and bird boxes, and habitat piles (see Section 5 below) and inclusion of fruit and nut producing species, and pollen and nectar rich species in the planting scheme.
- Corridors for the movement of wildlife have been provided around the site, with appropriately sensitive lighting design.

DNET has raised no objections subject to conditions securing the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures that are outlined within the latest ecology reports in support of the application. The relevant ecology reports to be included in the condition relate to: dormice, bats, reptiles, ecological appraisal, and a technical note.

With regard to biodiversity net gain (BNG), the Biodiversity Impact Assessment calculation was based on the emerging landscape scheme and indicates there would be a net loss for 'broad habitats' and a net gain for 'linear habitats'. If it is not possible to achieve a net gain in biodiversity within the site (as currently indicated by the calculator), then biodiversity offsetting will be required where any net loss is not outweighed by the planning balance. Off-site compensation could be achieved through:

- A contribution towards a strategic scheme for appropriate off-site compensation in the wider landscape. Such schemes are usually created and administered by the local planning authority;
- Approaches to a third party agent, such as The Environment Bank, who set up habitat creation and management agreements with local landowners; and/ or
- Creation of a bespoke scheme.

This would provide opportunity to target habitat creation/enhancement works in where maximum ecological benefit can be achieved, for example in the vicinity of designated sites and/or through complementing other ecological networks. This is considered to be an acceptable approach to the BNG requirements.

17. Summary of issues and the planning balance

It is important to recognise that Blandford Forum is a major settlement within the northern area needing to accommodate strategic growth. It is by its very nature a sustainable location for growth.

The Council's housing land supply is about to drop significantly below the requisite five years supply we should have, add to this the need for additional affordable housing. The Council's overall housing need is a material consideration of the highest importance.

The proposed development site can be viewed as infill development that will be read within its context, ie an urban extension to Blandford. The proposed scale and appearance of the development would not have a material impact on the Cranborne Chase National Landscape subject to conditions regarding external lighting, nor would it materially impact the open gap designation in the Pimperne NP

The benefits of the scheme relate to improved access and movement, along with the section 106 contributions listed above.

On balance, whilst the proposal would not comply with the development plan, taken as a whole, there are significant material considerations in terms of the benefits of this scheme, particularly with respect to housing, including affordable housing, and improved access and movement, which are considered to outweigh the conflict with the plan and the negative impacts associated with local landscape.

18. Recommendation

- a.) Grant, subject to the following conditions, and 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 items listed in this report.

Conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

180_DI_03.6 Location Plan

131_DI_08.2 Block Plan

131_DI_02.19 Site Layout Plan

180_DI_05.2 Dwelling Mix Plan

131_DI_06.4 Boundary Materials Plan

A052-P-202 External Materials Plan

Block of Flats 1-6 Block of Flats 1 - 6 Floor Plans & Elevations

Gla-B-AC Plot 7 Floor Plans & Elevations

1006-HA-B-I Plots 8 - 9 Floor Plans & Elevations

1006-HA-R-I Plots 10 - 11 Floor Plans & Elevations

Bea-B-I Plots 12 - 13 Floor Plans & Elevations

Lyt-BF-12-V Plots 14 & 22 Floor Plans & Elevations

Com-B-C Plots 15 - 16 Floor Plans & Elevations

Mor-BF-C-V Plot 17 Floor Plans & Elevations

Pul-BF-C Plot 18 Floor Plans & Elevations

Upw-B-I Plot 19 Floor Plans & Elevations

Wim-B-I Plot 20 Floor Plans & Elevations

Mar-B-I1 Plot 21 Floor Plans & Elevations

Mor-B-I Plots 23 - 24 Floor Plans & Elevations

Spe-BF-I Plot 25 Floor Plans & Elevations

Pul-B-I-V Plot 26 Floor Plans & Elevations

Bro-B-C Plot 27 Floor Plans & Elevations

Block of Flats HA 28-33 Block of Flats 28 - 33 Floor Plans & Elevations

DG2-B Double Garage 2-B Floor Plans & Elevations

TrG2-B-V1 Triple Garage 2-B-V1 Floor Plans & Elevations

TrG2-B-V2 Triple Garage 2-B-V2 Floor Plans & Elevations

Tw-G2-B Twin Garage 2-B Floor Plans & Elevations

23017 3 Tree Protection Plan

01-PHL-2001 Rev A - Extent of Highways Adoption

01-PHL-2101 Rev A – Preliminary Site Levels (1 of 2)

01-PHL-2102 Rev A – Preliminary Site Levels (2 of 2)

01-PHL-2103 Rev A – Road Profiles (1 of 2)

01-PHL-2104 Rev A – Road Profiles (2 of 2)

4111-LB-EX-XX-DR-E-7080-43 P02 Section 38 Street Lighting Maintained Levels

4111-LB-EX-XX-DR-E-7080-61 P01 Section 278 Maintained Levels

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

3. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, details of the following works shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- The creation for a new proposed roundabout junction connection from Salisbury Road into the development site as illustrated in Appendix A page 69 in the Transport Statement, drawing number 01-PHL-2002 Rev B (or similar scheme to be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority).

Thereafter, the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details and made available as such prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby approved. [OBJ]

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

4. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shown on drawings 131_DI_02.19, 01-PHL-2001 Rev A, 01-PHL-2101 Rev A and 01-PHL-2102 Rev A shall be constructed. Thereafter these areas shall be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

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

Reason: To ensure that a suitably surfaced and constructed access to the site is provided that prevents

loose material being dragged and/or deposited onto the adjacent carriageway causing a safety hazard

6. Prior to development above damp-proof course level, a scheme to prevent the discharge of surface water from the development onto the highway(s) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby approved and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

7. Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, the visibility splay areas as shown in the Transport Statement Appendix A page 70 on drawing 01-PHL-2003 Rev A must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.6 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015, or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, the visibility splay areas shall thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstruction above this height.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety.

8. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved a Construction Traffic Management Plan and programme of works shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include:
 - construction vehicle details (number, size, type, and frequency of movement)
 - a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries
 - timings of deliveries so as to avoid, where possible, peak traffic periods
 - a framework for managing abnormal loads
 - location of construction site access
 - contractors' arrangements (compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage)
 - wheel cleaning facilities
 - vehicle cleaning facilities
 - inspection of the highways serving the site (by the developer (or his contractor) and Dorset Highways) prior to work commencing and at regular, agreed intervals during the construction phase
 - a scheme of appropriate signing of vehicle route to the site
 - a route plan for all contractors and suppliers to be advised on
 - temporary traffic management measures where necessary
 - A sweeper will be required periodically to ensure the public highway is kept clear of loose debris that maybe transferred from the site.
 - Any site entrance gate that may need to be erected, will need to be set back a minimum of 15m from the edge of the carriageway.

Thereafter, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the agreed Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

9. 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 including clarification of how surface water is to be managed during construction, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, the approved surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and to improve habitat and amenity

10. Prior to occupation of the development, details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These shall include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

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

11. Prior to use or occupation of development hereby approved, a scheme showing details of the proposed cycle parking facilities shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. thereafter the approved details shall be implemented, maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.

Reason: To ensure provision of adequate cycle parking to support sustainable transport; in the interests of highway safety and residential amenity.

12. Prior to occupation or use of any building hereby approved, a pedestrian and cycling signage strategy shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Amongst other details this shall include information about the town, employment sites and shopping destinations, signage to be erected, when, and where. Thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: in the interest of public health and safety.

13. Prior to occupation or use of any building hereby approved, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local Planning Authority. This shall include measures for each phase of the development hereby approved. The Travel Plan, as submitted, shall include:

- Targets for sustainable travel arrangements.
- Effective measures for the on-going monitoring of the Travel Plan relative to the land use.

- A commitment to delivering the Travel Plan objectives for a period of at least five years from first occupation, or use, of each phase of the development.

- Effective mechanisms to achieve the objectives of the Travel Plan by the occupiers of the development for each phase.

Thereafter, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed 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 in the interest of health and safety.

15. Prior to commencement of any works on site, a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed CEMP. In particular, the CEMP should address public amenities such as air quality, noise pollution, and potentially unforeseen contamination.

Reason: in the interest of public health and safety.

16. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the recommendations and requirements in the ecological reports titled:

- Bat Survey Report (dated December 2023)
- Dormouse Survey Report (dated December 2023)
- Reptile Survey Report (dated December 2023)
- Ecological Appraisal (dated December 2023)
- Technical Note (dated 22nd July 2025)

and certified by the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team on 07/08/2025.

Prior to first occupation of any dwelling(s) hereby approved:

i) the recommendations detailed in each of the reports and Note listed above shall be completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable and

ii) evidence of compliance shall be supplied to the Local Planning Authority.

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

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

17. Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, above damp course level, a landscape management plan shall, by reference to site layout drawings of an appropriate scale, be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall include long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens. The subsequent management of the development's landscaping shall accord with the approved plan for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by the landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation or historical significance.

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

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and character of the area in the setting of a nationally recognised landscape.

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

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

20. Prior to any works above damp proof course, a lighting strategy which reflects the need to avoid harm to protected species and to minimise light spill, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There shall be no lighting of the site other than in accordance with the approved strategy. In particular, the strategy shall minimise impacts from lighting associated with preconstruction, construction and operational activities, and demonstrate how the current best practice (Bat Conservation Trust/Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2023) guidance has been implemented. This shall include details such as the following: artificial lighting associated with public realm lighting, car headlights associated with traffic movements through the development and internal and external lighting associated with the residential development.

Reason: to ensure the site's identified Greater horseshoe bat flight lines function as dark corridors (0.5 lux and warm light) and roosting features are unaffected by light spill, and generally in the interests of biodiversity

21. Prior to commencement of any works on site, a dust management plan (DMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details. In particular, the DMP should detail the mitigation measures to be applied, and the procedures for their implementation and management.

Reason: in the interest of public health and safety.

22. Prior to completion of the damp proof course of any dwelling in each phase of development, samples and, or, product details of materials for all roofing, walling, chimneys, rainwater goods and external surfaces shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Additionally, a sample panel measuring 1 metre by 1 metres of each principal facing wall shall be constructed on site to show details of coursing, mortar mix and pointing. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: in the interest of welfare and good design which is a key aspect of sustainable development.

23. Prior to completion of the damp proof course of any dwelling in each phase of development, samples and/or product details of proposed style of uPVC casement and sash windows shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: in the interest of good design which is a key aspect of sustainable development.

24. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order evoking and reenacting that Order) (with or without modification) no roof enlargement(s) or alteration(s) of the dwellinghouse hereby approved, permitted by Class B and Class C of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order, shall be erected or constructed.

Reason: To protect amenity and the character of the area with particular regard to the dark skies designation of the adjacent Cranborne Chase AONB

25. Prior to commencement of any works on site, a scheme for water efficiency for each phase of the development, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme demonstrate a standard of a maximum of 110 litres per person per day is applied for all residential development. The development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: This condition contributes to environmental objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

26. Notwithstanding the submitted Noise Impact Assessment (NIA), prior to use or occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the acoustic performance and ventilation system required for any dwelling(s) identified in the NIA shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy prior to occupation of any of the identified dwellings.

Reason: In the interest of amenity of future occupiers."

Informatives:

1. Informative: The applicant is advised that, notwithstanding this consent, if it is intended that the highway layout be offered for public adoption under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980, the applicant should contact Dorset County Council's Developer-Led Infrastructure team. They can be contacted by telephone at 01305 225401, by

email at dli@dorsetcc.gov.uk, or in writing at Developer-Led Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

2. INFORMATIVE NOTE: Privately managed estate roads

If the new road layout is not offered for public adoption under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980, it will remain private, and its maintenance will remain the responsibility of the developer, residents

or housing company.

3. Informative:

The junction works referred to in the recommended condition above must be carried out to the specification and satisfaction of the Highway Authority in consultation with the Planning Authority and it will be necessary to enter into an agreement, under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, with the Highway Authority, before any works commence on the site. The applicant should contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email athighwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

4. The highway improvement(s) referred to in the recommended condition above must be carried out to the specification and satisfaction of the Highway Authority in consultation with the Planning Authority and it will be necessary to enter into an agreement, under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, with the Highway Authority, before any works commence on the site. The applicant should contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email athighwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

5. The applicant should be advised that the Advance Payments Code under Sections 219-225 of the Highways Act 1980 may apply in this instance. The Code secures payment towards the future making-up of a private street prior to the commencement of any building works associated with residential, commercial and industrial development. The intention of the Code is to reduce the liability of potential road charges on any future purchasers which may arise if the private street is not made-up to a suitable standard and adopted as publicly maintained highway. Further information is available from Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

6. The Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service would recommend that you look to provide at least a 32mm minimum diameter water main which would enable the installation of sprinkler systems within the approved dwelling(s).

The Council considers this to be a key element in reducing the impact of fires. The Council believes there is compelling evidence that sprinklers systems are a cost effective way of not only reducing the number of fire deaths and injuries, but also reducing the economic, social and environmental impact of fires

- b.) Refuse permission for the reasons set out below if the agreement is not completed by 6 months from the date of committee or such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning:

The proposed development by reason of it lack of contributions to support off-site impacts and securing affordable housing would be detrimental to the surrounding areas services upon which it will rely contrary to Policies 8, 13, 14, and 15 of the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1.

This page is intentionally left blank