



Northern Area Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, 22 September 2026
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: Stour Hall - The Exchange, Old Market Hill, Sturminster Newton, DT10 1FH

Members (Quorum: 6)

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

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

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

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

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

Agenda

Item	Pages
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 5 - 16

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 4 August 2026.

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 18 September 2026.

5. P/OUT/2025/06511, 3 MAIDEN CASTLE ROAD, DORCHESTER, DORSET, DT1 2QG. 17 - 30

Erection of 1no. dwelling (outline application to determine access & layout).

6. P/PIP/2026/03481, LAND NORTH WEST OF HONEYBUN MEADOW, THE CAUSEWAY, HAZELBURY BRYAN. 31 - 48

Erection of up to 8no. dwellings (permission in principle).

7. P/VOC/2026/00999, LAND AT E 374230 N 117990 STATION ROAD STALBRIDGE. 49 - 62

Erect 130 No. dwelling, form public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) (with variation of conditions 1, 3 & 7 of planning permission no. APP/D1265/W/25/3365845 (LPA Reference P/RES/2023/05768) to reflect amended planting plans and Landscape Management Plan).

8. 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.

9. EXEMPT BUSINESS

To move the exclusion of the press and the public for the following item in view of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the meaning of paragraph x of schedule 12 A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended). The public and the press will be asked to leave the meeting whilst the item of business is considered.

There are no exempt items scheduled for this meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank



NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 4 AUGUST 2026

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

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

Lara Altree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Hannah Smith (Development Management Area Manager (North)), Louis Wicks (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice), Rob McDonald (Senior Planning Officer), Kirsten Williams (Lead Project Officer), Chris McDermott (Senior Housing Enabling & Policy Officer and Colm O'Kelly (Senior Landscape Architect).

145. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Rory Major, Barrie Cooper and Les Fry.

146. Declarations of Interest

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

147. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2026 were confirmed and signed.

148. 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.

149. P/OUT/2025/06076, Land off Manston Road, Sturminster Newton, DT10 1AF.

The Lead Project Officer presented the application using plans, aerial photographs and site images, and outlined the proposal and relevant planning policies. Members were advised that the Council's October 2025 five-year housing land supply statement identified a significant shortfall, confirming the Council can only demonstrate a deliverable housing supply that is equivalent to 2.53 years supply.

The site was located approximately 1 km from the town centre in a sustainable location with good access to services and facilities. Landscape visualisations demonstrated that proposed planting and landscaping would soften views of the

development over time, resulting in limited visual impact, including from the Trailway. Overall effects of the development on receptors would be minor or moderate adverse rather than major adverse (significant). The development would not adversely affect the Dorset National Landscape.

Members were informed that flood risk was low and that the proposed drainage strategy included attenuation basins and permeable paving which had been accepted by the Lead Local Flood Authority. Foul drainage would connect to the existing sewer on Manston Road via a pumping station on site. There would be no harm to heritage assets. The scheme would provide two access points with pedestrian crossing facilities and was not considered to raise highway safety concerns. Although some habitat and hedgerow loss would occur, the proposal would deliver biodiversity enhancements and net gain. The root protection area of protected Black Poplar trees could be affected but conditions could be imposed to determine the presence or absence of any tree roots. The site was not classified as best and most versatile agricultural land.

Members were advised that, in terms of the planning balance, weighing against the proposal was the conflict with the spatial strategy, however only limited weight could be given to this given the Council's housing land supply position. Weighing significantly in favour would be the provision of 50 dwellings, including affordable housing, as well as public open space and infrastructure contributions secured by legal agreement. Economic benefits would also arise through construction activity and local spending.

The Lead Project Officer concluded that there were no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development.

Public Participation

Public – Objection

Richard Nye

He explained to the Committee that he had lived on Manston Road for approximately 25 years and raised concerns regarding the cumulative impact of the proposed development on highway safety and the operation of Manston Road. Particular concern was expressed regarding the proposed principal access serving 50 dwellings. He highlighted that existing residential driveways were located opposite the proposed junction, together with a footpath providing access to the recreation ground.

Concerns were raised that vehicle movements associated with the development, existing residential traffic, pedestrians and crossing points would all be concentrated within a limited section of road and that residents were unclear whether the combined impact of these movements had been fully assessed.

He also raised concerns regarding the proposed secondary access and pedestrian crossing opposite an entrance to the Rixon Recreation Ground. Reference was made to highway safety measures previously introduced at this location following a fatal accident in 1982, including pedestrian railings, and it was suggested that the area had long been recognised as a sensitive location for pedestrian safety.

Further concerns were expressed regarding visibility and vehicle speeds on Manston Road, particularly for traffic approaching from Shaftesbury and cresting the nearby hill. He questioned whether sufficient assessment had been undertaken of the interaction between the proposed access arrangements, pedestrian crossing points and existing turning movements. It was noted that the applicant's traffic survey had recorded vehicle speeds above the posted 30mph limit, with typical speeds of 36-37mph and some vehicles travelling in excess of 50mph.

He also referred to an increase in the use of the road by agricultural vehicles, lorries and HGVs and expressed concern that no detailed assessment of vehicle types using the route had been undertaken.

In conclusion, he urged Members to consider whether the highway impacts had been adequately assessed in the context of how the road operates on a day-to-day basis and whether the proposed development was appropriate in this location.

Laura Hitchcock (Speaking on behalf of Manston Road Resident's Association)
She advised that residents recognised the need for additional housing within Dorset but questioned whether the application site represented an appropriate location for development and whether sufficient evidence existed to justify a different outcome from the Planning Inspector's decision issued approximately 18 months earlier.

Reference was made to the officer's report, which identified conflict with the development plan, landscape harm, the presence of two nationally significant native Black Poplar trees, and drainage and groundwater constraints. The objector accepted that these impacts had been identified and argued that the key issue for Members was whether the benefits of the development outweighed those harms.

She noted that proposals for housing on the site had been dismissed on appeal in 1978, 1995 and more recently in 2024, on the basis that development would harm the eastern edge of Sturminster Newton. It was argued that the current scheme was materially similar to previously refused proposals, comprising development on the same undeveloped hillside outside the settlement boundary with similar access arrangements and layout. Whilst recognising the proposed mitigation planting, the objector contended that landscaping could soften views but could not fully mitigate the loss of the site's undeveloped character.

She raised concerns regarding the proposed highway access arrangements. She questioned whether sufficient assessment had been undertaken of the cumulative interactions between the principal access, existing residential driveways, pedestrian crossing facilities and routes to the recreation ground. Further concern was expressed regarding the secondary access, its proximity to a hill crest, and recorded vehicle speeds on Manston Road.

In conclusion, she urged Members to consider whether any material circumstances, other than the Council's housing land supply position, had changed since the previous appeal decision and whether the evidence before the Committee justified departing from previous planning decisions relating to the site.

Courtenay Hitchcock

He advised that they recognised the need for additional housing in Sturminster Newton and explained that a number of major housing developments were already underway, with further growth proposed through both the Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging Dorset Local Plan. However, concern was expressed regarding whether the application site had been demonstrated to be suitable for development.

Reference was made to the Council's assessment, which identified the site as being affected by areas of high surface water flood risk and the highest category of groundwater emergence.

He stated that the drainage strategy had evolved significantly during the application process but that the understanding of groundwater conditions continued to rely primarily on a groundwater investigation undertaken during the summer of 2021. It was noted that the previous Planning Inspector had acknowledged limitations in the available groundwater evidence, and concern was expressed that no equivalent winter groundwater monitoring had been undertaken. He questioned whether the site's maximum groundwater levels were fully understood.

He also referred to the identification of two nationally significant female native Black Poplar trees on the site, which had initially been recorded as Poplar trees. It was noted that these rare trees were closely associated with local hydrological conditions and were located adjacent to the proposed sewage pumping station, access road and wider drainage infrastructure.

Concern was expressed regarding the potential long-term implications of the development on the trees and their environment.

He suggested that the emergence of additional information during the application process demonstrated that understanding of the site continued to evolve. It was therefore questioned whether sufficient information was available to conclude that the site was suitable for development in principle.

In conclusion, he requested that Members carefully consider whether there remained uncertainty regarding groundwater conditions and the potential impacts on the native Black Poplar trees, and whether outline planning permission could be granted with confidence in those circumstances.

Applicant/Agent

Alan Williams (Speaking on Behalf of the Applicant)

The agent acknowledged the concerns raised by local residents and advised that these had been fully considered throughout the determination of the application. Members were reminded that the application must be assessed against the current planning policy position and the evidence before the Committee.

It was noted that the Council could currently demonstrate a 2.53-year housing land supply and, as a consequence, the policies most important to determining the application were considered out-of-date. The agent advised that the presumption in favour of sustainable development was therefore engaged.

The proposal would provide up to 50 dwellings, including 40% affordable housing, together with public open space, biodiversity enhancements and financial contributions towards local infrastructure. These were presented as significant public benefits weighing in favour of the development.

Addressing technical matters, the agent stated that the Highway Authority had assessed the proposal and raised no objections, concluding that the residual highway impacts would not be severe. The Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency were similarly satisfied that flood risk and drainage matters could be addressed through planning conditions. It was further noted that consultees responsible for ecology, trees and residential amenity had raised no objections that would justify refusal.

In relation to landscape impacts, the agent acknowledged the site's planning history and the previous appeal decision. However, it was advised that the current application was supported by more detailed landscape evidence, including an updated Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The agent highlighted that the Council's Landscape Officer had concluded that, whilst the development would alter the existing settlement edge, the effects were not significant enough to warrant objection and could be appropriately mitigated through landscaping.

Members were reminded that the application was submitted in outline form, with all matters except access reserved for future consideration, allowing further scrutiny of the detailed design through a subsequent Reserved Matters application.

In conclusion, the agent stated that the adverse impacts identified did not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal, particularly in the context of the Council's housing land supply shortfall and therefore supported the officer recommendation for approval.

Parish/Town Council Rep

Cllr Andrew Donaldson (Sturminster Newton Town Council)

Cllr Donaldson addressed the Committee on behalf of Sturminster Newton Town Council. He questioned what material changes had occurred since the previous application was considered approximately two years ago and stated that he had seen no evidence to suggest the current proposal was materially different or more acceptable than the earlier scheme.

He acknowledged that the Committee's consideration related specifically to the proposed site access; however, he noted that approval of the access would, in effect, facilitate the wider development of the site. He advised that numerous objections had been submitted and confirmed that the Town Council supported the concerns raised by objectors.

Cllr Donaldson highlighted highway safety concerns, particularly in relation to traffic approaching from the north. He referred to a history of pedestrian fatalities in the area and expressed the view that the proposal would do nothing to reduce or mitigate existing risks.

Referring to the Sturminster Newton Neighbourhood Plan, which remains in force until 2030, he drew attention to the policy statement that "land east of Manston

Road is considered unsustainable for further development, particularly because of the topography, making it difficult for landscaping to soften the visual impact of building in the extensive wider views.” He submitted that the landscaping and mitigation measures proposed as part of the application were insufficient to address the visual impact of the development.

Cllr Donaldson stated that he could see no justification for granting the application, particularly in light of the previous refusal.

Officers responded to the comments raised by the speakers as follows:

- The Lead Project Officer advised that ongoing discussions had taken place with the Highway Authority, which was satisfied that the submitted Transport Assessment had appropriately assessed the impact of the development on the local highway network and affected junctions.
- It was highlighted that the Highway Authority had raised no highway safety or capacity concerns that would justify an objection to the application.
- In relation to concerns regarding the driveway opposite the site, Members were advised that this did not constitute a highway objection and that the Highway Authority considered the proposed arrangements to be acceptable.
- The Lead Project Officer referred to the baseline traffic data and the 85th percentile speed survey, explaining that highway engineers had reviewed the submitted information to ensure the suitability of the highway network. A speed survey had also been undertaken as part of the assessment process.
- Regarding pedestrian crossing facilities, it was noted that this issue had not previously been raised by the Highway Authority. The visibility available and vehicle speeds on the road had been assessed, and appropriate planning conditions could be imposed to secure measures such as dropped kerbs and traffic-calming or speed management works where necessary.

Members' questions and comments

- Members questioned why the application was recommended for approval despite a previous appeal dismissal, arguing that the landscape impact remained unchanged and expressing concern that too much weight had been given to the Council's housing land supply shortfall. Concerns were also raised regarding the housing mix, biodiversity net gain, local impacts and the age of the application.
- A proposal for refusal was sought on grounds of landscape and visual harm, impact on the character of Sturminster Newton, and unresolved drainage concerns.
- Concerns were expressed regarding highway safety, particularly the proposed access arrangements, pedestrian safety, visibility, and the absence of a Highway Authority representative. Some Members considered the scale and topography of the site unsuitable for a 50-dwelling development.
- Members raised questions regarding flooding, drainage infrastructure, management of attenuation ponds, affordable housing provision,

biodiversity impacts, and the suitability of the development for all users, including older residents.

- Several Members emphasised the importance of the Sturminster Newton Neighbourhood Plan and local consultation, noting that the site had been identified as unsuitable for development and arguing that greater weight should be afforded to local policies and representations.
- Members acknowledged the Council's lack of a five-year housing land supply but stressed that this should not outweigh other planning considerations. Concerns were reiterated regarding landscape harm, encroachment into the countryside, highway safety, drainage, and the potential impact on the delivery of other housing sites.
- Reference was made to previous appeal decisions, the town's character as a hilltop settlement, and the risk of setting a precedent for further development beyond the settlement boundary.

Officers provided the following responses to Members' questions:

- The Lead Project Officer advised that additional information had been submitted since the previous appeals and that the Council's housing land supply position had changed significantly. It was confirmed that biodiversity net gain could be increased to meet the 10% requirement, whilst housing mix would be considered at a later stage. Members were also advised that third party surveys had identified one female and two male Black Poplar trees in the southeast corner of the site.
- The Senior Landscape Architect explained that, although previous appeal decisions identified some adverse landscape effects, the visual impact was not considered significant. He advised that the site had moderate landscape sensitivity and value, with impacts capable of being mitigated through landscaping and planting. Detailed drainage matters would be addressed at the reserved matters stage.
- The Development Management Area Manager advised that the proposal sought approval for up to 50 dwellings and two access points, with detailed design matters to be considered later. The Highway Authority had assessed the application and raised no objections to the principle of development or the proposed accesses. Significant weight should be given to the provision of 40% affordable housing.
- Members were advised that previous appeal decisions and matters including flooding, heritage and landscape impacts had been carefully considered. Whilst the site lay outside the settlement boundary, officers had not identified harm sufficient to outweigh the benefits.
- In response to highway concerns, it was confirmed that the Highway Authority had reviewed the transport and visibility assessments and raised no objections. Collision data did not indicate an existing highway safety issue, and the site was considered sustainably located with suitable pedestrian access.

The Committee was adjourned from 12:12 - 12:23.

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 **REFUSE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** planning permission as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Jones.

Decision: To refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the appendix to these minutes.

Break: 12:28 -13:00.

150. **P/FUL/2025/05229, Pleydells Farm, Lower Street Okeford Fitzpaine, Dorset, DT11 0RQ.**

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

Members were advised that housing targets had increased significantly since the previous appeal decision and that the site, although outside the settlement boundary, was considered to be in a sustainable location.

The site forms Phase 2 of a wider development, with Phase 1 already approved and under construction. Previous appeal concerns relating to layout, pedestrian safety, parking arrangements and the attenuation pond had been addressed through revisions to the scheme, including a dedicated footway, amended parking layout and clearer drainage proposals.

Members were advised that the development would provide a mix of affordable and market housing, with design and scale reflecting local character. Officers considered that impacts on the National Landscape, heritage assets and the Conservation Area would be limited.

Ecological enhancements, including biodiversity net gain, landscape planting, hedgerow translocation, bat and bird features, were proposed. The site lies within Flood Zone 1, with a low risk of flooding, and the dwellings would incorporate air source heat pumps.

The Case Officer concluded that the concerns raised in relation to the previous scheme had been satisfactorily addressed and recommended approval, subject to conditions.

Public Participation

Public Objection

Cllr George Norris did not attend the meeting.

Applicant/Agent

Matthew Holmes (Agent)

Mr Holmes advised that the application had been submitted following previous applications and that the plans had been amended during the course of the application in response to feedback received. He welcomed the officer recommendation for approval and stated that the scheme had been carefully designed to fit with the character of the area.

He explained that the proposed buildings were of a traditional design and provided a mix of dwelling sizes. Landscaping was proposed for the front and rear gardens together with an area of green space on the western edge of the site. The scheme had also been designed to take account of the site's biodiversity interests.

Mr Holmes stated that the relevant Council policy criteria had been considered throughout the design process. All dwellings would meet or exceed the minimum national space standards and would benefit from appropriately sized rear gardens. He added that the proposed density of development was comparable to that of surrounding properties.

Reference was made to the officer's report, which concluded that the proposals were acceptable in terms of design and visual impact and would provide a suitable living environment for future residents. He further noted that the proposed dwellings were appropriately separated from neighbouring properties and that the relationship between existing and proposed homes had been carefully planned.

Mr Holmes reminded Members that the proposal was unchanged from the previous application that had been determined at appeal. He stated that the appeal decision had confirmed that the development was acceptable in terms of design, heritage and drainage considerations and that the site represented an appropriate location for new housing. He explained that the previous appeal had been dismissed for two specific reasons: the mix of affordable housing units and housing supply matters.

He advised that both issues had now been addressed. The affordable housing mix had been amended to meet the relevant requirements and housing supply calculations had changed since the appeal decision. As Dorset was now experiencing a housing land supply shortfall, the proposal would assist in meeting identified housing needs.

In conclusion, Mr Holmes considered the proposal to be a well-designed residential development that was appropriate to its context and capable of delivering much-needed housing on a site that was suitable for residential development by virtue of its location and the characteristics of the surrounding area.

Parish Council

Cllr Rachael Rowe (Speaking on behalf of Okeford Fitzpaine Parish Council)

Cllr Rowe acknowledged that the proposed development contained some interesting design features; however, she advised that the Parish Council remained opposed to the scheme.

She informed Members that, when the Parish Council had last considered the site, Phase One of the development had been suspended due to instability in construction costs. As a result, she questioned when the proposed homes would be delivered, despite the acknowledged need for additional housing within Dorset.

Cllr Rowe stated that the development would extend beyond the settlement boundary of Okeford Fitzpaine and would therefore result in development within the open countryside. She expressed concerns regarding the impact on wildlife and suggested that approval could set a precedent for further development outside the settlement boundary.

Concerns were also raised in relation to highway safety. Cllr Rowe advised that access to the development would be via Lower Street and that the Parish Council remained concerned about visibility at the junction with Play Close. She explained that vehicles parked outside existing properties could restrict sightlines, particularly during busy periods. Additional concerns were raised regarding the proximity of the village play area, with fears that children may not be readily visible to drivers because of limited visibility from the junction.

She further noted that Lower Street was not routinely gritted during winter conditions and considered that the cumulative impact of traffic generated by this and other developments in the village would exacerbate existing highway issues. Parking pressures within the village centre were also highlighted, with vehicles frequently parked on local streets, which in turn could further affect visibility and road safety.

Cllr Rowe advised that the site was located away from the main transport corridor and was therefore less well connected to facilities and services. Public transport provision within the village was described as limited, and no plans had been identified to increase services to meet the demands arising from additional housing development.

The Parish Council also expressed concern that, despite continued housing growth, local infrastructure had deteriorated. Reference was made to the loss of significant employment opportunities in the area, the closure of the village primary school in 2023, and the resulting absence of pre-school and childcare provision. Cllr Rowe also referred to the loss of the visiting GP service, inadequate or poor-quality pavement infrastructure restricting access for wheelchair users, ageing electricity infrastructure resulting in frequent power outages, and limited public transport services.

Members questions and comments

- Members commented that the development was a modest extension to the existing settlement and sought reassurance that affordable housing would be visually consistent with market housing. Clarification was also requested on refuse collection arrangements.
- Questions were raised regarding the access road, pedestrian provision and adoption standards. It was noted that previous concerns regarding the housing mix had been addressed, and support for the application was expressed.
- Concerns were raised regarding local school capacity and the availability of education facilities.
- Members sought clarification on pedestrian links, management of communal areas and drainage arrangements. It was suggested that the site layout appeared constrained and could have been designed more efficiently.
- Concerns were expressed about the settlement's sustainability, particularly the availability of local employment, healthcare and education services, with questions raised as to whether residents would need to travel elsewhere for many day-to-day needs.
- Members also questioned whether Okeford Fitzpaine would still meet the criteria for designation as a larger village given the loss of some local services and facilities.

In response to Members' questions, officers provided clarification on a number of matters relating to the proposed development:

- Officers advised that the scheme included footways throughout the development and would provide suitable pedestrian access.
- Okeford Fitzpaine was considered a sustainable location in planning terms, consistent with the settlement hierarchy and previous appeal findings, despite the absence of local education and healthcare facilities.
- The Highway Authority had assessed the proposal and raised no objections, subject to conditions.
- Officers confirmed that any significant design concerns regarding affordable housing would have been addressed during the application process.
- Refuse collection would be accommodated through kerbside collection, with a small number of residents required to present bins at nearby collection points.
- Members were advised that contributions towards local infrastructure would be secured through a planning obligation and that nearby settlements provided education facilities.
- The development was designed to accommodate residents and service vehicles, with drainage measures incorporated to manage surface water and reduce flood risk.
- Officers noted that applications must be determined against current planning policies and advised that Okeford Fitzpaine would continue to be classified as a larger village within the settlement hierarchy.

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

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

151. **P/MPO/2026/01652, West of Shaftesbury Road At, Land South of Gillingham, Shaftesbury Road, Gillingham.**

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 consider the modification of S106 legal agreement on Gillingham Park Farm Deed of Variation dated 2nd April 2024 to remove Clause 2.8 under schedule 2 which reads 'no more than 30% of the intermediate units shall be discounted market units'.

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Members discussed the proposed affordable housing arrangements and the practical challenges associated with delivery.
- A Member expressed concern that it was unfortunate for prospective residents if affordable housing could not be delivered in its preferred form and sought clarification on whether the proposed discounted market housing units would remain affordable in perpetuity.
- Members acknowledged the challenging market conditions currently facing affordable housing providers. It was noted that the business model for registered providers had become increasingly difficult in recent years and that no affordable housing provider had been secured for the scheme.
- Further comments were made supporting the provision of affordable housing wherever possible. However, Members recognised the difficulties currently affecting the sector and welcomed efforts to identify an alternative mechanism for delivering more affordable homes as part of the development.

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 Jespersen, and seconded by Cllr Ridout.

Decision: To grant planning permission and approve the modification of the agreement.

152. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

153. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 2.33 pm

Chairman

.....

Application Number:	P/OUT/2025/06511
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/plandisp.aspx?recno=418530
Site address:	3 Maiden Castle Road, Dorchester, Dorset, DT1 2QG
Proposal:	Erection of 1no. dwelling (outline application to determine access & layout)
Applicant name:	Ms Abigail Cook
Case Officer:	Jamie Francis
Ward Members:	Cllr Canning and Cllr Fry

1. **Reason application is going to committee:** Objection from Ward Member (Cllr Fry), contrary to Officer recommendation to grant permission.

2. **Summary of recommendation:**

Grant of planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report

3. **Key planning issues**

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	In terms of location for a new dwelling, the site is in accordance with the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan's (LP) spatial strategy. The site is located within the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) for Dorchester, and under Policy SUS2 (Distribution of Development) of the LP this is where residential development will be permitted. Policy SUS2 identifies Dorchester as a main town and therefore is a "highest priority location" for new development.
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	This is an outline application, that only determines access and layout. However, a reasonable sized home and private garden area can comfortably be delivered on the plot, whilst allowing the existing dwelling to retain sufficient private garden space. The layout of the site indicates that the dwelling will be positioned relatively close to the front of the site. Whilst this is not typical, the south side of Maiden Castle Road features dwellings at various orientations and layouts.
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	The overall impact on amenity cannot be fully assessed at outline stage, however it is considered feasible to deliver a dwelling in this location without resulting in significant harm to neighbouring amenity through overshadowing and loss of privacy.

Issue	Conclusion
Impact on heritage assets	The site is within the wider setting of Grade II listed 18 Maiden Castle Road, which is located the opposite side of the road and further along to the West. The setting of this building has been largely diminished by modern development surrounding it, and therefore it is considered that the setting does not contribute greatly to the asset's significance. For this reason, the proposed development is considered to result in no harm to the setting of such.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	The access would be positioned in close proximity to traffic calming chicanes. The Highways Officer determined that the new access would not result in safety concerns. Adequate parking and turning space will be created on site. The parking provision meets the Council's standards.
Impact on trees	The site features a mature beech tree; however, this tree is not protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), nor is it protected by virtue of being located in a Conservation Area. The Council's Tree Officers do not intend to serve a TPO on the tree. Therefore, the tree is not fundamental to the principle of development in this location. The Council would prefer for this mature tree to be maintained as part of any landscaping scheme, and this is what is indicated on the site plans and within Biodiversity Net Gain assessments.
Biodiversity Net Gain	The proposed development results in a net loss of 0.03 habitat units, and a net loss of 0.05 hedgerow units. The habitat lost is largely vegetated garden and ornamental hedgerow, which is considered of low distinctiveness. Therefore, the proposed development fails to meet the required 10% net gain on site. Given that habitat creation and enhancement cannot be legally secured in private gardens, BNG will be delivered using off site credits. This is considered acceptable.
Nutrient Neutrality	The site is located within the Poole Harbour Nutrient Catchment Area. The scheme relies on the purchase of phosphorus/nitrogen credits from an approved nitrogen mitigation scheme. Natural England has no objection to this approach.

4. Description of site

The site is located along the south side of Maiden Castle Road. The site is currently in use as domestic garden area of 3 Maiden Castle Road, a detached two-story dwelling that is accessed through Temple Close. The site is currently bordered by domestic/ornamental hedges.

The overall site under the same ownership (red and blue line boundary) is approximately 800 square metres, which would be segregated into two parcels of land, with the site at the focus of this development (within red line boundary) at approximately 375 square metres.

The site appears to be relatively flat, with no obvious slopes. The garden area is largely lawn, featuring a mature beech tree.

The site is surrounded by residential development in all directions. The other dwellings on the south side of Maiden Castle Road, and the cul-de-sac of Temple Close are suburban housing estates likely constructed in the 1970s. The dwellings along the south side of Maiden Castle

Road are laid out in a mixed form, some perpendicular to the road, and others facing the road. The dwellings are largely detached, and set back from the road, but there is not a consistent building line.

5. Description of development

Erection of 1no. dwelling (outline application to determine access & layout)

6. Background and relevant planning history

Reference: P/HOU/2024/01836. Decision: Granted. Decision Date: 20/05/2024

Description: Erect 2 storey side extension

7. List of constraints

- Site is within Poole Harbour Nutrient Catchment Area
- Site is within a Groundwater Source Protection Area
- Setting of nearby Grade II listed building: 18 Maiden Castle Road

8. Consultations

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

Consultees

1. Natural England

The scheme relies on the purchase of phosphorus/nitrogen credits from an approved nitrogen mitigation scheme. I can confirm Natural England has no objection to this approach. Please note however as the Competent Authority it is your responsibility to ensure that you are confident that there is sufficient information to support the values used in the nitrogen calculation, and that the nutrient budget calculation is correct.

On this basis Natural England agrees with the submitted Appropriate Assessment. The authority should be mindful of the need to secure the mitigation measures including ensuring that the proposed new development is required to limit water use to 110 l per person per day. Ensuring the requisite phosphorus/nitrogen credits are secured by any permission.

2. DC - Environmental Assessment

The submitted nutrient calculator is acceptable and the nutrient budget for the development is 3.14 kg TN/yr pre-2030 and 1.14 kg TN/yr post- 2030 (annual).

3. DC - Highways

The location for this access is in a 30mph zone and the requirement for a clear line of sight is 43m in both directions. When a vehicle egresses out of the proposed access, it will have the visibility from the footway located behind the traffic calming.

The traffic calming will act as a speed deterrent which will allow for a vehicle to come onto the D20915, Maiden Castle Road in a safer manner. Any vehicles travelling from east to west would have to slightly veer to the centre of the road to avoid the traffic calming or slow down to allow for an oncoming vehicle to pass, therefore, making it safer for a vehicle to egress out of the access.

Vehicles that may speed along this stretch of highway will need to be reported to the police. I understand this may be a cut through for those taking their children to school, but it will not be

any different to accesses located on an A or B road which would have a more intensification of use.

Looking at the collision history, I see there were 2 minor incidents in 2023 opposite Britannia Road and the other in 2024 near Capitol Close. Both incidents do not involve any traffic calming or any accesses coming onto Maiden Castle Road.

Overall, the proposal meets the MFS and the NPPF 115,116 standards and is not a highway safety issue. The Highway Authority has no objection, subject to conditions.

4. DC - Dorset Waste Team

No comments received

5. DC - Building Control

Building Regulations approval would be required. Compliance with Requirement B4 would need to be checked if the boundary has moved to facilitate the development

6. DC – Trees

I recommend that a Tree Survey comprising an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement that complies with British Standard (BS) 5837:2012 - is submitted for approval to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposal and design whilst protecting the significant Beech tree in particular).

7. DC – Conservation

I can confirm that there are no objections on heritage grounds.

8. DC – Dorchester West – Cllr Canning

No comments received

9. DC – Dorchester West – Cllr Fry

Wish to object to the driveway for the following reasons:

- The property already appears to benefit from a safe vehicle access directly onto Temple Close, and the proximity of traffic calming furniture adjacent to the property.
- Installing an extra driveway will simply be dangerous for both the householder and other road users, adding confusion to an already crowded street scene.

10. P - Dorchester TC

No objection. The Committee asked that the design of the proposed dwelling be in keeping with the established character of the locality

Representations received

Total - objections	Total - No objections	Total - comments
5	0	0

Summary of comments of objections:

Objections were raised citing reasons of:

- Negative impact upon Highway safety

- Negative impact on free flow of traffic
- Negative impact on pedestrian safety
- Layout is out of character with locality/neighbourhood
- Proposal would constitute overdevelopment
- Negative impact on trees and wildlife

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.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is 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.

Relevant policies

Development plan

In this case the development plan comprises:

West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Adopted 2015):

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

- INT1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- ENV2: Wildlife and Habitats
- ENV4: Heritage Assets
- ENV10: The Landscape and Townscape Setting
- ENV11: The Pattern of Streets and Spaces
- ENV12: The Design and Positioning of Buildings
- ENV13: Achieving High Levels of Environmental Performance
- ENV15: Efficient and Appropriate Use of Land
- ENV16: Amenity
- SUS1: The Level of Economic and Housing Growth
- SUS2: Distribution of Development
- COM7: Creating a Safe & Efficient Transport Network
- COM9: Parking Provision

Material considerations

Emerging local plans:

Policy DM4: Emerging development plan proposals 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 emerging Dorset Local Plan is being prepared in accordance with plan-making processes set out in the Levelling Up and Regenerating Act 2023 and Local Planning Regulations (2026). As the plan is still at an early stage of the plan making process, limited weight can be attached to it when taking decisions on planning applications. Decisions on planning applications should continue to be assessed against the policies in adopted development plans, national planning policy and any other relevant material considerations.

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

The Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy identifies local priorities for nature recovery and maps areas where action would be most beneficial. In planning decisions it is a material consideration, helping to ensure that development supports biodiversity enhancement and aligns with Dorset's agreed priorities for nature recovery.

National Planning Policy Framework (17 August 2026)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published on 17 August 2026, sets out the Government's national planning policies for both plan-making and decision-making in England.

When determining development proposals decision-makers are required to take a positive and proactive approach and to seek to approve sustainable development where possible.

The NPPF introduces a permanent presumption in favour of sustainable development, through Policies S3 to S5 (which replaces the former "tilted balance" contained in paragraph 11 of the previous NPPF) and sets out the principles for development within and outside settlements. The Framework also confirms that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Other relevant NPPF chapters and policies include:

- Chapter 3: Decision making policies. DM3: Determining development proposals Local planning authorities should approach decision making positively, proactively and proportionately. They should work with applicants through pre-application engagement and consultations and aim to resolve concerns through planning conditions or obligations where possible to avoid delay and to enable an approval rather than a refusal. Applications that accord with the development plan, the NPPF and other material considerations should not be refused where they can clearly be approved.
 - DM3 Determining development proposals
 - DM6 Use of planning conditions and obligations
- Chapter 4: Achieving Sustainable Development. The objective of the policies in this chapter is to meet development needs through sustainable patterns of development, including by maximising the potential for growth on suitable land within settlements, enabling development which will support the rural economy, rural communities and the provision of infrastructure, and limiting development away from settlements to help safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

- S3 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- S4 Principle of development within settlements
- Chapter 6: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes. Planning decisions should give substantial weight to providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community.
 - HO7 Meeting the need for homes
- Chapter 12: Making effective use of land. Planning decisions should give substantial weight to proposals that make more effective use of land and buildings, while maintaining good design, living conditions and local character. This includes redevelopment of previously developed, vacant, underused, contaminated or derelict sites, reuse of existing buildings, creation of additional homes through sensitive infill, upward extensions and development within existing plots. Higher-density development is also promoted within settlements in well-connected locations near public transport. Development that fails to make efficient use of land in accordance with the policy should be refused.
 - L2 Making effective use of land
 - L3 Achieving appropriate densities
- Chapter 14: Achieving well-designed places. Development should be high quality, respect and enhance local character, deliver sustainable and attractive places, and accord with relevant design policies. Proposals that demonstrate good design and place-making should be supported, while those that fail to meet established design standards should be refused unless clearly justified.
 - DP3 Key principles for well-designed places
 - DP4 The design process
- Chapter 15: Promoting sustainable transport. The objective of the policies in this chapter is to ensure that transport considerations are taken fully into account in the preparation of development plans and the evolution and assessment of development proposals; using a vision-led approach to embed the role that transport infrastructure and choices can play in creating well-designed, sustainable, inclusive and popular places.
 - TR3 Locating development in sustainable locations
 - TR4 Street design, access and parking
 - TR6 Assessing transport impacts

National Planning Practice Guidance

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.

Housing land supply

Dorset Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply. The position set out in the latest Housing Land Supply Report is 2.53 years on 1st April 2025. In addition, the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the levels of housing needed under the Government's revised standard method. Recent calculations suggest a need of c. 3,246 new homes per year. Under the new NPPF, the consequence is that Policy S5(1)(j) applies. This supports granting permission for development outside of settlements that aims to address unmet need. It states that development needs to be "physically well-related to an existing settlement ... and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing and proposed availability of infrastructure." However, Policy S5 suggests that permission should not be given when:

- "the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the [NPPF]"; or
- "the nature of the development would make this inappropriate"

Housing Delivery Test (HDT)

The latest HDT results (2025 measurement) show that insufficient homes have been delivered within the local plan area (88%) and that a local action plan is required.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. Planning Assessment

The application is for outline planning permission for the principle of residential development, which is for the erection of 1 dwelling, and the access and layout of the development, with all other matters reserved.

Principle

Policy SUS1 (Level of Economic and Housing Growth) outlines that in the period 2011-2031 provision will be made for a deliverable supply of housing land to accommodate in the region of 15,500 dwellings.

In terms of location, the site is considered in accordance with the LP spatial strategy. The site is located within the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) for Dorchester, and under Policy SUS2 (Distribution of Development) of the WDWPLP residential development will normally be permitted. SUS2 identifies Dorchester as a main town, and therefore is a “highest priority location” for new development.

Therefore, the principle of housing in this location accords with development plan policy, and material considerations further emphasise the acceptability of the principle, owing to Dorset’s housing shortfall in both supply and delivery, and the sustainable location of the site.

Access

The main point of contention with regarding the site, appears to be in relation to the new access proposed off Maiden Castle Road. The proposed access would be positioned in close proximity to traffic calming chicanes. The Highways Officer determined that the new access would not result in safety concerns.

Further clarification was sought from the Highways Officer, who explains that the “location for this access is in a 30mph zone and the requirement for a clear line of sight is 43m in both directions. When a vehicle egresses out of the proposed access, it will have the visibility from the footway located behind the traffic calming. The traffic calming will act as a speed deterrent which will allow for a vehicle to come onto the D20915, Maiden Castle Road in a safer manner. Any vehicles travelling from east to west would have to slightly veer to the centre of the road to avoid the traffic calming or slow down to allow for an oncoming vehicle to pass, therefore, making it safer for a vehicle to egress out of the access”.

The Highways Officer recommends conditions relating to Vehicle access construction, Turning/parking construction, Cycle Parking and submission of a Construction Method Statement (CMS). The conditions relating to Vehicle access construction and turning/parking construction have been included on the decision note, to ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site in the interest of highway safety.

The condition requesting cycle parking is not considered necessary at this stage. The requirement of a CMS is not included as a condition. This is due to the small-scale nature of the project and the availability of accessing the site from Temple Close (a cul-de-sac), and sufficient on-site storage space for materials. Therefore, this condition is not considered to be necessary or reasonable in this instance.

Whilst the objections and comments of the Ward Member and third parties are noted, overall, it is considered, owing to the assessment of the Highways Officer and conditions, that the proposed development will not result in safety issues for Highway users or pedestrians.

Layout

Objections were received on the basis of overdevelopment, and the layout not being in-keeping with the surrounding area. The site is broadly a rectangular shape, of approximately 375 square metres. The erection of 1 dwelling within such is not considered overdevelopment, and sufficient parking/turning space, a reasonable sized home and private garden area can comfortably be delivered on the plot, whilst allowing the existing dwelling to retain sufficient garden space.

The layout of the site indicates that the dwelling will be positioned relatively close to Maiden Castle Road. Whilst this is not typical, the south side of Maiden Castle Road features dwellings at various orientations and without a consistent building line. Whilst the dwellings to the North side of Maiden Castle Road are positioned in a uniform manner, with a clear building line, the dwellings to the south side of Maiden Castle Road are uniform in design but more eclectic in positioning and building line.

Whilst the dwelling would be located closer to the highway than other dwellings, this is not considered to result in significant harm to the character of the area, which features some

variation in frontages. This would particularly be the case if the design of the dwelling at reserved matters stage is in-keeping, and a sufficient landscaping scheme is delivered.

Other Matters

Trees

The site features a mature beech tree; however, this tree is not protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), nor is it protected by virtue of being located in a Conservation Area. The Council's Tree Officers do not intend to serve a TPO on the tree. The Council's Tree officer requested an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement. However, owing to the fact that the tree is not protected and Council has no intention to protect this tree, these documents are not considered necessary at this stage, as the retention of the tree is not fundamental to the principle of development in this location.

Whilst the Council would prefer for this mature tree to be maintained as part of any landscaping scheme, and this is what is indicated on the site plans and within Biodiversity Net Gain assessments. Tree protection measures or further details relating to foundations may be investigated further at Reserved Matters stage.

Heritage

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is 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.

The site could be considered to be within the wider setting of 18 Maiden Castle Road, which is located the opposite side of the road. 18 Maiden Castle Road is designated for its special architectural or historic interest. The building was originally constructed within a suburban area, and the setting of this building has been further diminished by modern development surrounding it, and therefore it is considered that the setting does not contribute greatly to the asset's significance. For this reason, the proposed development is considered to result in no harm to the setting of such.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

The proposed development results in a net loss of 0.03 habitat units, and a net loss of 0.05 hedgerow units. The habitat lost is largely vegetated garden and ornamental hedgerow, which is considered of low distinctiveness. Therefore, the proposed development fails to meet the required 10% net gain on site. Given that habitat creation and enhancement cannot be legally secured in private gardens, BNG will be delivered using off site credits.

Nutrient Neutrality

The site is located within the Poole Harbour Nutrient Catchment Area. The scheme relies on the purchase of phosphorus/nitrogen credits from an approved nitrogen mitigation scheme. Natural England has no objection to this approach, subject to conditions relating to purchase of credits and limiting water usage to 110 litres per person per day. These conditions have been included on the decision note to ensure nutrient neutrality is secured through effective mitigation.

Groundwater Source Protection Area

The site is within a groundwater source protection area. An informative note has been included on the decision note, whereby the applicant is advised that care should be taken during the construction to avoid any contaminants entering the groundwater.

13. Summary of issues and the planning balance

The proposed development is considered to result in an additional dwelling within a highly sustainable location, within the defined development boundary of Dorchester. It is not

considered to result in adverse effects in relation to highway safety, heritage assets, neighbouring amenity, character and appearance of the area, or internationally protected sites. Therefore, the proposed development is judged to comply with the development plan taken as a whole, and no material considerations indicate a decision should be made otherwise.

14. Recommendation

Grant of planning permission subject to the following conditions

1. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until details of all reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, scale) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory development of the site.

2. An application for approval of any 'reserved matter' must be made 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 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

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

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
4297_P_001 Location Plan
4297_P_003A Proposed Site Plan

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

5. Before the development hereby approved is first occupied the first 5 metres of the vehicular access, measured from the nearside edge of the carriageway, including the visibility splays, shall have been laid out, constructed, and surfaced, to a specification which shall have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety.

6. Before the development hereby approved is first occupied or utilised the turning and parking shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter, these areas must be permanently maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site in the interest of highway safety.

7. No development shall commence until the necessary nutrient mitigation credits to mitigate the impacts of the development on the Poole Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) have been secured from an accredited nutrient provider and a copy of the Nutrient Credit Certificate demonstrating that purchase, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient mitigation is provided against any impact which may arise from the development on the Poole Harbour SPA.

8. Details of measures to limit the potential consumption of wholesome water use by persons occupying the new dwelling to 110 litres per person per day as measured in accordance with regulation 36 of the Approved Document for Part G2 of the Building Regulations 2010 (or any equivalent regulation revoking and/or re-enacting that Statutory Instrument) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the dwelling is occupied. The submitted details shall include a water consumption calculation for the dwelling in accordance with the Approved Documents referred to above. The approved measures shall be implemented and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority thereafter.

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

Informative Notes:

1. Informative: The vehicle crossing serving this proposal (that is, the area of highway land between the nearside carriageway edge and the site's road boundary) must be constructed to the specification of the County Highway Authority in order to comply with Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant should contact Dorset Highways by telephone at Dorset Direct (01305 221020), by email at dorsethighways@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Dorset Highways, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the public highway.
2. The applicant is advised that the site lies within an area of groundwater protection. Care should be taken during the construction to avoid any contaminants entering the groundwater.
3. Informative: National Planning Policy Framework

In accordance with policy DM3 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

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

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

In this case:

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

4. 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 the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

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

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

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

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements listed below are considered to apply.

Read more about Biodiversity Net Gain and Biodiversity Gain Plans at
<https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/biodiversity-net-gain> and
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/submit-a-biodiversity-gain-plan>

5. 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.

Application Number:	P/PIP/2026/03481
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Land North West of Honeybun Meadow The Causeway Hazelbury Bryan
Proposal:	Erection of up to 8no. dwellings (permission in principle)
Applicant name:	Mr John Romans
Case Officer:	Jim Bennett
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Murcer

1. Reason application is going to committee:

The matter was called in for Committee determination by the Chair and Vice Chair under the Scheme of Delegation referral procedure, considering Hazelbury Bryan Parish Council's objection to the departure from the provisions of the Neighbourhood Plan, the officer recommendation being one to grant, subject to conditions.

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	Whilst the proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy of the Development Plan, including the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan, and that conflict is afforded significant weight, the proposal would help address identified unmet housing needs, and the site's sustainable relationship with the existing settlement are material considerations of considerable weight. The principle of residential development is therefore considered acceptable.
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	The illustrative plan shows eight modest dwellings could comfortably sit on the site with adequate private amenity space, scope for landscaping and access, without producing a cramped or inappropriate form of development, considered to be in character with the area. Full details to be addressed at the Technical Details stage

Issue	Conclusion
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	A proposal for eight dwellings along the lines of the illustrative plan provided could be designed to provide appropriate levels of amenity, in accordance with Policy 25. Full amenity impacts to be assessed at the Technical Details stage
Flood risk and drainage	The site is not at risk of flooding. Conceptual drainage scheme at the Technical Details stage to address surface water disposal.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	The illustrative layout suggests highway issues raised would not be insurmountable and may be addressed at the Technical Details Stage.
Impact on trees	None
Biodiversity	A scheme could be designed to safeguard any wildlife interest and appropriate mitigation secured. Any Technical Details submission to be accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment to ensure biodiversity enhancements and Biodiversity Net Gain are realised.

4. Description of site

The site adjoins the Hazelbury Bryan Settlement Boundary to the south. Hazelbury Bryan is one of the larger settlements in North Dorset and the site sits close to the village shop and a short distance from the public house and Alec's Field Recreation Ground, some 350m away to the south.

The site is currently an undeveloped paddock, to the south west of Daisy Meadows, a relatively recent residential development of eight dwellings. The site is bound to the south by existing residential development at Honeybun Meadow. To the east is a site known as Rowlands Yard with consent for four dwellings under ref. P/PIP/2026/00690. To the north, the site bounds the village shop and a site with consent for 8 dwellings under ref. P/PIP/2026/00303.

5. Description of development

The application proposes eight dwellings on the site and comprises a location plan identifying the site in red, a block plan and an illustrative plan showing eight detached and semi-detached dwellings and general access and parking arrangements on the site, with a shared point of access from The Causeway.

Due to the type of application (Planning in Principle), the only planning consideration is the principle of development. All other matters such as highways, neighbour amenity, design, flood risk and biodiversity would fall to be considered at the Technical Details stage. While these

matters fall to be considered at a later stage, they are briefly addressed below, to inform the Technical Details stage.

6. Background and relevant planning history

2/2010/1187/PLNG - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 24/01/2011 - Change of use from agricultural building (barn) to village shop. Make alterations to existing access.

2/2018/0107/OUT - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 18/05/2018 - Develop land by the erection of 8 No. dwellings, form vehicular access and car parking. Form public footpath on land south of The Beeches. (Outline application to determine access).

2/2018/1814/REM - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 19/08/2019 - Erect 8 No. dwellings, form vehicular access and car parking. Form public footpath on land south of The Beeches. (Reserved Matters application to determine appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, following the grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2018/0107/OUT).

P/PIP/2026/00690 – Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 16/03/2026 - Erect 4 no. dwellings (permission in principle)

P/PIP/2026/00303 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 10/06/2026 - Erection of up to 8 no. dwellings (permission in principle)

7. List of constraints

NPLA - Neighbourhood Plan Area - Hazelbury Bryan - Distance: 0

LP - North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2031); Adopted; Outside settlement boundaries (countryside); Policy 2, 20; NULL - Distance: 0

DESI - Wessex Water Treatment Works Catchment Other WRC catchments - Distance: 0

PROW - Right of Way: Footpath N41/31; - Distance: 0

WW - Wessex Water Sewage Treatment Works 2023 Odour - Distance: 0

DESI - Higher Potential ecological network - Distance: 0

DESI - High Opportunity Nature Areas - Distance: 0

DESI - Potential Activities - Distance: 0

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Rooksmoor (UK0012681); - Distance: 1469.48

DESI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone; - Distance: 0

8. Consultations

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

P - Hazelbury Bryan PC

- The site is not in the Neighbourhood Plan. NDDC & DC's approach so far has broadly been to refuse applications that are not in the Neighbourhood Plan since approving extra development will jeopardise the viability of sites already allocated for development in the Neighbourhood Plan
- The Planning Statement brushes aside our Neighbourhood Plan, barely acknowledging its existence. It also ignores the fact that our NP policies have full planning weight until March 2029. There was a crucial change in the National Planning Policy Framework in December 2024 that gives full weight to NPlan policies for NPlans that are less than 5 years old. Our NPlan is only just over two years old, so policies in the N Plan have full planning weight until March 2029. The applicant quotes DC's housing supply being only 2.53 years. In the past this would have been relevant, but the NPPF change mentioned above gives full weight to NPlan policies notwithstanding the planning authorities overall supply situation.
- The site is outside the Settlement Boundary. Whilst the draft Dorset Plan envisages removing
- Settlement Boundaries, at present it still exists.
- The site design allows for future "add-on" development opportunities further into the field in the future
- This was not a site even considered by DC in its new draft Plan
- This small area of the village has seen very worrying development "creep" over the last few years, and this is yet another example. It started with the Daisy Meadow development opposite the Red Barn shop, which crept in just before our emerging Neighbourhood Plan had any significant planning weight. It was followed by the approval for Rowlands Yard (P/FUL/2022/06869) and then most recently P/PIP/2026/00303 at the Red Barn shop. The latter has just been approved, over-ruling our objection and we have lodged a detailed complaint about this with Dorset Council. If this application is approved it will make a total of 32 new dwellings in this part of the village, whereas our Neighbourhood Plan allocated none here.
- HBPC would also urge you not allow the approval to be yet another precedent that. This would completely undermine the worth and value of the Neighbourhood Plan and the planning weight given to its policies under paragraph 14 of the NPPF. If Neighbourhood Plan policies in a fully up-to-date Plan can be so easily disregarded, the future for existing and new Neighbourhood Plans looks bleak indeed.
- Taking all these into account, the Parish Council OBJECTS to this application

DC - Highways

- The estate road layout needs amendment before it can be considered to be safe for all road users and suitable for adoption under s38 of the Highway Act (if offered), as detailed below.
- In order to assess the application on a highway safety perspective, a drawing will need to be submitted showing the measurements of the access road serving the site 5.5m in width for the first 30m of its length from the main road, to provide safe passing of vehicles and to allow for the provision of the necessary white lining, etc.
- The remainder of the layout should then be provided at a 5.0m width to allow for the two-way flow of vehicles. A 2.0m wide footway should then be provided on both sides of the internal carriageway to facilitate safe movement from all properties and to have due regard for the guidance provided by Inclusive Mobility.
- Pedestrian connectivity will need to be shown with a footway adjacent to The Causeway leading to the shop and towards Honeybun Meadow. The footways will need to be 2m wide.
- At the location for the access, a tactile dropped crossing point will be required to allow. This will allow for inclusive mobility and prams and pedestrians a safer mode of getting to amenities.
- A swept path analysis would need to be submitted showing a refuse vehicle/fire tender, able to enter the site and turn and drive out in a forward gear.
- Once the changes have been made to the estate road design, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit of the highway layout must be submitted in support of the development proposal.

Representations received

Two objections received raising the following points:

- The site on agricultural land and there is no access to the farmland behind. This is the only entrance to the field.
- The overall size of the plot is small for 8 houses. One of the plots has no allocated parking which would mean parking on the road and obstructing access. The maximum number of houses should be no more than four.

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

Adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2016):

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

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 20: The Countryside
Policy 23: Parking
Policy 24: Design
Policy 25: Amenity

Made Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan (March 2024):

Policy HB1: Reinforcing Local Landscape Character
Policy HB2: Protecting and Enhancing Local Biodiversity
Policy HB5: Locally Distinctive Development
Policy HB13: Settlement Boundaries and Important Gaps
Policy HB15: Meeting Housing Needs – Amount and Location of New Dwellings
Policy HB16: Meeting Housing Needs – Dwelling Types
Policy HB22: Parking Provision

Other Material Considerations

Emerging draft Dorset Council Local Plan:

Policy DM4: Emerging development plan proposals 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 emerging Dorset Local Plan is being prepared in accordance with plan-making processes set out in the Levelling Up and Regenerating Act 2023 and Local Planning Regulations (2026). As the plan is still at an early stage of the plan making process, limited weight can be attached to it when taking decisions on planning applications. Decisions on planning applications should continue to be assessed against the policies in adopted development plans, national planning policy and any other relevant material considerations.

Housing land supply

Dorset Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply. The position set out in the latest Housing Land Supply Report is 2.53 years on 1st April 2025. In addition, the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the levels of housing needed under the Government's revised standard method. Recent calculations suggest a need of c. 3,246 new homes per year. Under the new NPPF, the consequence is that Policy S5(1)(j) applies. This supports granting permission for development outside of settlements that aims to address unmet need. It states that development needs to be "physically well-related to an existing settlement ... and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing and proposed availability of infrastructure." However, Policy S5 suggests that permission should not be given when:

- "the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the [NPPF]"; or
- "the nature of the development would make this inappropriate"

Housing Delivery Test (HDT)

The latest HDT results (2025 measurement) show that insufficient homes have been delivered within the local plan area (88%) and that a local action plan is required.

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

The Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy identifies local priorities for nature recovery and maps areas where action would be most beneficial. In planning decisions it is a material consideration, helping to ensure that development supports biodiversity enhancement and aligns with Dorset's agreed priorities for nature recovery.

National Planning Policy Framework 2026:

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published on 17 August 2026, sets out the Government's national planning policies for both plan-making and decision-making in England.

When determining development proposals decision-makers are required to take a positive and proactive approach and to seek to approve sustainable development where possible.

The NPPF introduces a permanent presumption in favour of sustainable development, through Policies S3 to S5 (which replaces the former "tilted balance" contained in paragraph 11 of the previous NPPF) and sets out the principles for development within and outside settlements. The Framework also confirms that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant NPPF sections include:

- Chapter 3: Decision making policies. Local planning authorities should approach decision making positively, proactively and proportionately. They should work with applicants through pre-application engagement and consultations and aim to resolve concerns through planning conditions or obligations where possible to avoid delay and to enable an approval rather than a refusal. Applications that accord with the development plan, the NPPF and other material considerations should not be refused where they can clearly be approved.
- DM3 Determining development proposals

- Chapter 4: Achieving Sustainable Development. The objective of the policies in this chapter is to meet development needs through sustainable patterns of development, including by maximising the potential for growth on suitable land within settlements, enabling development which will support the rural economy, rural communities and the provision of infrastructure, and limiting development away from settlements to help safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
 - S3 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - S5 Principle of development outside settlements
 - S6 Neighbourhood plans and the presumption
- Chapter 6: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes. Planning decisions should give substantial weight to providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community.
 - HO7 Meeting the need for homes
- Chapter 12: Making effective use of land. Planning decisions should give substantial weight to proposals that make more effective use of land and buildings, while maintaining good design, living conditions and local character. This includes redevelopment of previously developed, vacant, underused, contaminated or derelict sites, reuse of existing buildings, creation of additional homes through sensitive infill, upward extensions and development within existing plots. Higher-density development is also promoted within settlements in well-connected locations near public transport. Development that fails to make efficient use of land in accordance with the policy should be refused.
 - L2 Making effective use of land
 - L3 Achieving appropriate densities
- Chapter 14: Achieving well-designed places. Development should be high quality, respect and enhance local character, deliver sustainable and attractive places, and accord with relevant design policies. Proposals that demonstrate good design and place-making should be supported, while those that fail to meet established design standards should be refused unless clearly justified.
 - DP3 Key principles for well-designed places
 - DP4 The design process
- Chapter 15: Promoting sustainable transport. The objective of the policies in this chapter is to ensure that transport considerations are taken fully into account in the preparation of development plans and the evolution and assessment of development proposals; using a vision-led approach to embed the role that transport infrastructure and choices can play in creating well-designed, sustainable, inclusive and popular places.
 - TR3 Locating development in sustainable locations

- Chapter 19: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment: Development should conserve and enhance the natural environment by protecting important landscapes, habitats, biodiversity and trees, while maximising opportunities for nature recovery, green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain. Proposals should avoid significant environmental harm, prioritise land of lower environmental value where possible, and be sensitively designed in protected landscapes and coastal areas. Development causing unacceptable impacts on designated sites, irreplaceable habitats or biodiversity that cannot be adequately avoided, mitigated or compensated for should be refused.
 - Improving the natural environment biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.
- N2 Improving the natural environment

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.

Housing land supply

Dorset Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply. The position set out in the latest Housing Land Supply Report is 2.53 years on 1st April 2025. In addition, the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the levels of housing needed under the Government's revised standard method. Recent calculations suggest a need of c. 3,246 new homes per year. Under the new NPPF, the consequence is that Policy S5(1)(j) applies. This supports granting permission for development outside of settlements that aims to address unmet need. It states that development needs to be "physically well-related to an existing settlement ... and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing and proposed availability of infrastructure." However, Policy S5 suggests that permission should not be given when:

- "the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the [NPPF]"; or
- "the nature of the development would make this inappropriate"

Housing Delivery Test (HDT)

The latest HDT results (2025 measurement) show that insufficient homes have been delivered within the local plan area (88%) and that a local action plan is required.

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 proposal seeks Permission in Principle for residential development on land immediately adjacent to the existing settlement of Hazelbury Bryan. The site is within reasonable walking distance of local services and facilities, including the village shop and other community facilities, and is well-related to existing residential development. As such, the site is considered to represent a sustainable location with the potential to provide future residents, including those with protected characteristics, access to housing and local services.

At this stage, only the principle of residential development, land use and amount of development are under consideration. Detailed matters relating to accessibility, layout, movement, parking arrangements, pedestrian connectivity and the design of any dwellings would be considered as part of any subsequent Technical Details Consent application.

The Council is satisfied that no adverse impacts on persons with protected characteristics have been identified at the Permission in Principle stage. Furthermore, the Public Sector Equality Duty is a continuing duty and will remain a material consideration at the Technical Details Stage, where detailed design and accessibility matters can be fully assessed.

13. Public Benefits

The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These include a small contribution to the current under-supply of housing land by the provision of up to 8 market units and jobs from construction.

14. Planning Assessment

Principle of development

Policies 1 and 2 of the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (NDLP), outline the Council's strategy for achieving sustainable development within the former North Dorset area.

Conflict with the North Dorset Local Plan

Policy 2 (the Core Spatial Strategy of the NDLP) identifies the four main towns in the district (Blandford, Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Sturminster Newton) as the primary focus of growth, with Stalbridge and a list of 18 larger villages, including Hazelbury Bryan, accommodating further development to meet local needs. Development outside defined settlement boundaries is treated as countryside, where development is strictly controlled.

In this instance, the site is located beyond the defined settlement boundary of Hazelbury Bryan, meaning for policy purposes it is located in the countryside. Policy 20 of the NDLP states that development in the countryside will only be permitted where it is of a type appropriate to a countryside location, or where an overriding need for the development to be located in the countryside can be demonstrated.

The proposal comprises up to 8 market dwellings on an unallocated greenfield site outside the settlement boundary and does not fall within any of the categories of development envisaged by Policy 20. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with Policies 2 and 20 of the NDLP and, more generally, with the spatial strategy of the development plan. Significant weight is attached to this conflict.

Conflict with the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan

In addition to the above assessment against the Local Plan, the site is also located within the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan (HBNP) area. The HBNP was made in March 2024, forms part of the statutory development plan and is therefore afforded full weight.

Policy HB15 of the HBNP allocates land for 55 dwellings within the village for the plan period (2018-2033) and states that 'the release of unallocated greenfield sites outside the settlement boundary should be limited to rural exception affordable housing sites, and sites for open market housing should therefore be resisted'.

The application proposes up to 8 open market dwellings on an unallocated greenfield site beyond the settlement boundary. The proposal therefore directly conflicts with Policy HB15 and the wider spatial strategy of the HBNP. Significant weight is attached to this conflict.

Notwithstanding the identified conflict with the HBNP and Policies 2 and 20 of the NDLP, the decision must also have regard to the Policy 1 of the NDLP and the relevant provisions of the NPPF.

Policy 1 of the NDLP and the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 1 of the NDLP establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development and reflects the approach set out in national policy. The policy confirms that development proposals which accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. It further provides that where the policies most important for determining an application are out of date, permission should be granted unless material considerations indicate otherwise, provided the development would represent sustainable development.

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The latest Housing Land Supply position identifies a supply of 2.53 years. As a consequence, the policies most important for determining the application, including those which restrict the supply of housing through the settlement boundary and countryside strategy, attract reduced weight in the decision-making process.

Nevertheless, those policies remain part of the development plan and the conflict identified with Policies 2 and 20 of the NDLP, and Policy HB15 of the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan, continues to attract great weight. The extent to which those conflicts are outweighed by other material considerations is considered below having regard to Policies S5 and S6 of the NPPF.

National Planning Policy Framework

Policy S3 of the NPPF establishes a permanent presumption in favour of Sustainable Development. For proposals outside of settlements, this includes consideration of Policy S5.

Policy S5 lists the forms of development that are appropriate outside of settlement boundaries and indicates that planning permission should be granted for such forms of development unless the benefits of the proposal are substantially outweighed by the adverse effects when assessed against the national decision making-policies of the NPPF.

Policy S5(1)(j) provides support for development that would address an evidenced unmet need, including housing proposals where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites or is delivering less than 75% of its housing requirement through the Housing Delivery Test. The policy requires that such development is physically well-related to an existing settlement and is of a scale capable of being accommodated having regard to infrastructure provision.

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the latest published Housing Land Supply position identifying a supply of 2.53 years. Furthermore, the most recent Housing Delivery Test results indicate housing delivery of 88%, demonstrating continuing under-delivery of housing within the local plan area.

In this case, the proposal would contribute towards addressing an identified unmet housing need at a time of significant housing land supply shortfall. The site is immediately adjacent to the built-up area of Hazelbury Bryan and is well-related to existing and approved residential development. It is also located within reasonable walking distance of services and facilities within the village. With a maximum of 8 dwellings proposed, the scale of development is modest and there is no evidence before the Council to suggest that the proposal could not be accommodated having regard to infrastructure capacity.

Policy S6 of the NPPF recognises the importance of neighbourhood planning and indicates that, for housing proposals, the adverse effects of granting permission are likely to substantially outweigh the benefits where a proposal conflicts with a neighbourhood plan that became part of the development within the previous five years and contains allocations to meet its identified housing requirement.

The HBNP was made in March 2024 and contains allocations intended to meet the housing requirement identified at the time of its preparation. Accordingly, the circumstances described within Policy S6 are engaged and substantial weight is attached to the identified conflict with the HBNP.

Other Material Considerations

Whilst substantial weight is attached to the conflict with the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with Policy S6 of the NPPF, there are other material considerations which weigh in favour of the proposal.

Since the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan was prepared and made, there have been significant changes to national policy and the methodology used to calculate housing requirements. In particular, the revision to the Standard Method published in December 2024 resulted in a substantial increase in Dorset's assessed housing requirement of approximately 80%. Whilst this does not diminish the development plan status of the HBNP, nor the weight afforded to it through Policy S6 of the NPPF, it is a material consideration which demonstrates that the housing need now identified across Dorset is materially greater than that which informed the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the latest Housing Land Supply position identifying a supply of 2.53 years. Furthermore, the most recent Housing Delivery Test results indicate that only 88% of the required homes have been delivered within the local plan area, resulting in a requirement for a Housing Delivery Action Plan. These circumstances demonstrate a significant and continuing shortfall in housing delivery.

The proposal would contribute towards addressing this housing shortfall through the delivery of up to 8 dwellings. Whilst modest in scale, the proposal would assist in increasing housing supply at a time when the Council faces a substantial deficit in deliverable housing land. Significant weight is therefore attached to the contribution the proposal would make towards meeting identified housing needs.

In addition, whilst the site lies beyond the defined settlement boundary of Hazelbury Bryan, it is immediately adjacent to the existing built form of the village and is well-related to existing and permitted residential development. The site is within walking distance of local services and facilities, including the village shop, and would not result in isolated or unsustainably located development within the countryside. The scale of development proposed is modest and there is no evidence before the Council to suggest that the proposal could not be accommodated having regard to existing or proposed infrastructure provision. These factors attract moderate weight in favour of the proposal.

Planning Balance

The proposal conflicts with Policies 2 and 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan and Policy HB15 of the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan. Significant weight is attached to these conflicts. Furthermore, Policy S6 of the NPPF supports the attachment of substantial weight to the conflict with the recently adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

However, significant weight must also be afforded to the Council's inability to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the continuing under-delivery of housing within the local plan area and the contribution the proposal would make towards addressing identified

housing needs. Further weight is afforded to the site's sustainable relationship with the existing settlement and the modest scale of development proposed.

Having regard to the above, it is concluded that the material considerations in favour of the proposal are sufficient to outweigh the identified conflict with the Development Plan in this instance. The principle of residential development is therefore considered acceptable

Accordingly, the Permission in Principle can be recommended for approval. The overall acceptability of any scheme would require all other matters to be addressed at Technical Details Consent Stage. At this stage however, there is no reason to believe that an appropriate scheme to address other matters could not come forward.

Impact on character and appearance of the area

There are existing housing developments and extant consents adjacent to and opposite the application site (see Map 1). In view of this, development of the site for housing purposes would not be at odds with the overall character of development in this part of the village. The scheme would not result in significant encroachment into the open countryside, more an infill scheme between existing and proposed housing developments. The illustrative plans suggest overdevelopment will be avoided. Eight modest dwellings could comfortably sit on the site with adequate private amenity space, scope for landscaping and access, without producing a cramped or inappropriate form of development, considered to be in character with the area. It is not abundantly clear from the illustrative submission whether adequate access, parking and turning provision can be achieved, but this could be addressed at the Technical Details stage.

While the site lies within the countryside, there is no reason to believe that an appropriately designed scheme could not come forward, with matters of access/turning, scale, design, landscaping and appearance assessed at the Technical Stage. The illustrative layout shows how a development of 8 dwellings could be accommodated, in character with the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with Local Plan Policy 24 and Policy S5e of the NPPF.

Amenity Impacts

In respect of impacts upon the amenities of neighbouring properties in terms of overbearing impact, loss of outlook, unreasonable loss of light, noise, disturbance, other pollution and amenity of future occupiers, it is apparent that a proposal for eight dwellings along the lines of the illustrative plan provided could be designed to provide appropriate levels of amenity, in accordance with Policy 25. Full amenity impacts to be assessed at the Technical Details stage

Flood Risk

The site is not considered at increased risk of flooding based upon the National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA2), or the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Whilst the increase in impermeable surfacing could result in increased surface water, submission of a conceptual drainage scheme at the Technical Details stage could address this matter.

Access and Highway Safety

The proposal will utilise an existing field gate access for vehicular access to the site. The Highway Authority note that the illustrative estate road layout needs amendment before it can be considered to be safe for all road users and suitable for adoption under s38 of the Highway Act. With this in mind, they indicate that drawings are necessary to make provision for safe passing of vehicles, to allow for the provision of white lining and 2m wide footways on both sides of the internal carriageway to facilitate safe movement. Pedestrian connectivity will need to be shown with a 2m footway adjacent to The Causeway leading to the shop and towards Honeybun Meadow, tactile dropped crossing point provided at the access and swept path analysis provided showing a refuse vehicle/fire tender, able to access and egress the site. Once the changes have been made to the estate road design, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit of the highway layout must be submitted in support of the development proposal. As a permission in principle application, the LPA cannot request submission of details to address these points at this stage. They would more appropriately be addressed by any Technical Details submission and an informative is applied to this effect.

The illustrative layout suggests the requests made by Highways, would not be insurmountable at the Technical Details Stage. The Technical Details should also clarify the off-street parking arrangements for all plots, as the illustrative plan suggests one plot is devoid of any, which needs to be clarified.

Biodiversity

The Council has a legal duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Policy 4 of the Local Plan advises that developments that offer gains in biodiversity whether through the restoration of habitats or the creation of linkages between existing sites, will be looked upon favourably in the decision-making process. A scheme could be designed to safeguard any wildlife interest and appropriate mitigation secured. Any Technical Details submission should be accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment agreed with Dorset Council's Natural Environment Team to ensure biodiversity enhancements and Biodiversity Net Gain are realised.

At this stage, it cannot be determined if the proposal will be exempt from biodiversity net gain.

Other Matters

The Parish Council notes that the site design allows for future "add-on" development opportunities further into the field in the future. The site plan is illustrative and does show the potential for access to the field to the west, albeit occupied by a bin area. This cannot substantiate a reason for refusal, but the case officer's view is that this area should be shown as planted in the landscaping arrangements submitted with any subsequent Technical Details proposal.

With regard to the comments of notified parties on access to the field system to the west, this is primarily a matter for the applicant to address, but it would be useful to understand how this might work under any Technical Details submitted.

The site directly adjoins Footpath N41/31 to the south east and the proposal does not impinge upon its line. However, any Technical Details submission will be expected to enhance its setting, through sensitive form of development and landscaping.

Conclusions

The proposed development conflicts with the Development Plan when read as a whole, including Policies 2 and 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan and Policy HB15 of the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan. Significant weight is attached to this conflict. However, the Council's inability to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the continuing under-delivery of housing within the local plan area and the contribution the proposal would make towards addressing identified housing needs are material considerations that attract significant weight in favour of the development.

Further weight is afforded to the site's sustainable relationship with Hazelbury Bryan, its proximity to local services and facilities, and the modest scale of development proposed. Officers are satisfied that the site represents an accessible and sustainable location for residential development and that there is no evidence before the Council to suggest that the development could not be accommodated without unacceptable environmental impacts. Matters relating to design, layout, highways, ecology, drainage and accessibility would be considered in detail at the Technical Details Consent stage.

Having regard to the above, it is concluded that the material considerations in favour of the proposal are sufficient to outweigh the identified conflict with the Development Plan in this instance. The principle of residential development is therefore considered acceptable and the application is recommended for approval, subject to the subsequent consideration of Technical Details Consent.

15. Recommendation

GRANT subject to the following conditions:

1. Technical details consent shall be applied for and approved within the three-year time limit of this permission in principle consent.

Reason: As directed by the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017.

2. The minimum number of residential dwellings permitted by this permission in principle is 8 and maximum number of residential dwellings permitted by this permission in principle is 8.

Reason: As required by the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017.

Informative Notes:

1. For the avoidance of doubt, the following plans that have been considered in granting this permission, but are considered illustrative at this stage:

Location and Block Plan: 20076-3

Existing Site Survey: 20076-1

Proposed Site Survey: 20076-2

2. The applicant is advised to review the Officer Report and case file associated with this consent P/PIP/2026/03481 and to address the salient issues raised by consultees. These should be submitted as part of any subsequent Technical Details Planning Submission. Detailed plans and statements will be required to demonstrate the development will be acceptable in respect of Highways, Biodiversity (BNG), Visual Appearance, Amenity, et al.

3. Dorset Council Building Control Informatives

1. The garages and houses must comply with the requirements of B4 of the Building Regulations (with regard to not having combustible materials near to, or on a site or notional boundary)

2. Fire and Rescue Service access to accord to the requirements of B5 of the Building Regulations

4. Informative: National Planning Policy Framework

In accordance with policy DM3 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

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

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

In this case the application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

5. 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 the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the 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.

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

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.

On the basis of the information provided to determine the application, it is not possible to indicate whether it is considered that this planning permission is one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun. This is because it cannot be determined whether the permission would benefit from a self-build exemption, or the de minimis exemption.

Before commencing development, you should consider whether a Biodiversity Gain Plan needs to be submitted and approved. Commencing development which is subject to the biodiversity gain condition without an approved Biodiversity Gain Plan could result in enforcement action for breach of planning control.

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

Application Number:	P/VOC/2026/00999
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Land At E 374230 N 117990 Station Road Stalbridge
Proposal:	Erect 130 No. dwelling, form public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) (with variation of conditions 1, 3 & 7 of planning permission no. APP/D1265/W/25/3365845 (LPA Reference P/RES/2023/05768) to reflect amended planting plans and Landscape Management Plan)
Applicant name:	Mr Mike Cleveland
Case Officer:	Philip Longhurst
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Carr-Jones

1. Reason application is going to committee: Officer recommendation is contrary to the objection from the Town Council.

2. Summary of recommendation:

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

grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report

3. Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	Principle of the development is established and not being considered under this Variation of Conditions Application.
Design, landscaping, impact on character and appearance	The proposed amendments would not have any impact upon the approved built elements of the development. The proposal involves alterations to the existing and approved landscaping which is not considered to adversely impact the character or appearance of the development.
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	The proposal would not impact upon the living conditions of occupants nor neighbouring properties.
Flood risk and drainage	The proposed amendments would allow for the revised drainage strategy.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	The proposals do not impact the highway network or access or parking.

Issue	Conclusion
Impact on Trees/Hedges	The proposal would result in the loss and translocation of some native hedgerow. No existing trees would be impacted. Significant additional planting would be provided to offset the loss of hedgerow.
Biodiversity	The revised Landscape Ecological Management Plan has been agreed by the Natural Environment Team.

4. Description of site

The site is located in the countryside to the east of Stalbridge. It is broadly rectangular in shape with access directly onto the site from Station Road.

The site area is approximately 5.6ha of arable land immediately to the east of the Stalbridge settlement boundary. It is partially bounded by hedging to the north, south, east and west. There is a public bridleway (N51/74) along part of the western boundary.

The surrounding area to the north, east, and south is arable land; to the east is Station Road Business Park and Stalbridge.

5. Description of development

The application in consideration is seeking the approval of the variation of conditions 1, 3 & 7 of planning permission no. APP/D1265/W/25/3365845 (LPA Reference P/RES/2023/05768) to reflect amended planting plans and Landscape Ecological Management Plan.

6. Background and relevant planning history

2/2019/1799/OUT - Decision: REF - Decision Date: 10/09/2021

Develop land by the erection of up to 130 No. dwellings (including affordable housing), form vehicular access from Station Road, public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS). (Outline application to determine access).

P/RES/2023/05768 - Decision: REF - Decision Date: 20/03/2025

Erect 130 No. dwellings, form public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS). (Reserved matters application to determine appearance, landscaping, layout and scale; following the grant of Outline Planning Permission No. APP/D1265/W/21/3284485 (LPA Ref.2/2019/1799/OUT).

2/2019/1799/OUT - Appeal Allowed - 20/06/2022

Develop land by the erection of up to 130 No. dwellings (including affordable housing), form vehicular access from Station Road, public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS). (Outline application to determine access).

Erect 130 No. dwellings, form public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS). (Reserved matters application to determine appearance, landscaping, layout and scale; following the grant of Outline Planning Permission No. APP/D1265/W/21/3284485 (LPA Ref.2/2019/1799/OUT)).

7. List of constraints

TPO - TPO (TPO-637-2020) - NULL: NULL - Distance: 0

TPO - TPO (TPO/2020/0005) - NULL: NULL - Distance: 0

TPO - TPO (NDDC/TPO-637-2020) - NULL: NULL - Distance: 0

NPLA - Neighbourhood Plan Area - Stalbridge - Distance: 0

LP - North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2031); Adopted; Outside settlement boundaries (countryside); Policy 2, 20; NULL - Distance: 0

LEGAL - S106 - Unilateral Undertaking - NULL - Distance: 0

DESI - Wessex Water Treatment Works Catchment Other WRC catchments - Distance: 0

PAR - Stalbridge CP - Distance: 0

WARD - Stalbridge & Marnhull Ward - Distance: 0

PROW - Right of Way: Bridleway N51/74; - Distance: 1.56

SGN - Medium pressure gas pipeline 12.5m or less from 12.5m Buffer on Regional Medium Pressure Pipelines (75 mbar – 2 bar); - Distance: 0

DESI - Existing ecological network - Terrestrial - Distance: 0

DESI - Higher Potential ecological network - Distance: 0

DESI - Site of nature conservation interests (SNCIS): ST71/053 - Stalbridge; - Distance: 0

DESI - Wildlife Present: Hemlock ; - Distance: 0

DESI - Wildlife Present: bird ; - Distance: 0

DESI - Wildlife Present: S41 - bird ; - Distance: 0

DESI - Wildlife Present: bat ; - Distance: 0

DESI - Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Rooksmoor (UK0012681); - Distance: 4086.98

DESI - Agricultural grade: Grade 4; - Distance: 0

DESI - Agricultural grade: Grade 3b; - Distance: 0

DESI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone; - Distance: 0

EA - Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 30 - Distance: 0

EA - Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 100 - Distance: 0

EA - Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 1000 - Distance: 0

FLD - Surface water flooding - 1 in 100 year event plus 20% allowance - Distance: 0

FLD - Surface water flooding - 1 in 100 year event plus 40% allowance - Distance: 0

RAD - Radon: Class: 1.0 - Distance: 0

8. Consultations

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

Consultees

DC – Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection to the extension of the surface water interception swale around the north of the site

DC – Landscape – Original Comments – Unable to support – recommendation that the hedgerow is translocated to the rear of the SuDS channel rather than being removed. Clarification of tree pit details are required.

DC – Landscape – Comments following revisions – *‘I have reviewed the revised planting plan DD635 revision K dated 09.04.2026 (plan 2 Of 4) which shows the re-introduction of tree planting and the translocation of a section of existing hedgerow along the frontage of the site and find it to be acceptable.’* - No objection to the LEMP.

DC - Trees (North West Weymouth) – Agreement with the comments from the Landscape officer in relation to the translocation of the hedge.

DC - Natural Environment Team – Original Comments – Further information required regarding a 10 meter-wide dark corridor and the inclusion of the amended swales within the LEMP.

DC - Natural Environment Team – Comments following revisions – No further comments following the submission of the revised LEMP. The LEMP condition can be discharged from an ecological perspective.

Stalbridge TC – Original Comments – *‘Unable to support this variation. The Town Council share the views of the Senior Landscape Architect in her report of 5 March 2026. Moreover, there needs to be absolute clarity with regards to the impact on the two hedges along the northern boundary. It is understood that the proposed changes are to remove the western hedge completely and to strive to retain the eastern hedge albeit cut back to facilitate the drainage work. Whilst there is reference to Arboriculturist input required, on the amended planting plan, there appears to have been no further reference to this.’*

Stalbridge TC – Comments following revisions – Nothing further to add

Representations received

Summary of comments of objections: None received

Summary of comments of support: None received

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 & 2 – Sustainable Development Strategy

Policy 3 – Climate Change

Policy 4 – The Natural Environment

Policy 24 – Design

Policy 25 – Amenity

Material considerations

Emerging draft Dorset Council Local Plan:

Policy DM4: Emerging development plan proposals 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 compliance of the relevant policies in the emerging plan with the policies for plan-making in the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given to them).

The emerging Dorset Local Plan is being prepared in accordance with plan-making processes set out in the Levelling Up and Regenerating Act 2023 and Local Planning Regulations (2026). As the plan is still at an early stage of the plan making process, limited weight can be attached to it when taking decisions on planning applications. Decisions on planning applications should continue to be assessed against the policies in adopted development plans, national planning policy and any other relevant material considerations.

Emerging neighbourhood plans

Stalbridge- In preparation - limited weight applied to decision making

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

The Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy identifies local priorities for nature recovery and maps areas where action would be most beneficial. In planning decisions it is a material consideration, helping to ensure that development supports biodiversity enhancement and aligns with Dorset's agreed priorities for nature recovery.

National Planning Policy Framework (17 August 2026)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published on 17 August 2026, sets out the Government's national planning policies for both plan-making and decision-making in England.

When determining development proposals decision-makers are required to take a positive and proactive approach and to seek to approve sustainable development where possible.

The NPPF introduces a permanent presumption in favour of sustainable development, through Policies S3 to S5 (which replaces the former "tilted balance" contained in paragraph 11 of the previous NPPF) and sets out the principles for development within and outside settlements. The Framework also confirms that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant NPPF chapters and policies include:

- Chapter 3: Decision making policies. DM3: Determining development proposals Local planning authorities should approach decision making positively, proactively and proportionately. They should work with applicants through pre-application engagement and consultations and aim to resolve concerns through planning conditions or obligations where possible to avoid delay and to enable an approval rather than a refusal. Applications that accord with the development plan, the NPPF and other material considerations should not be refused where they can clearly be approved.
- Chapter 5: Meeting the challenges of climate change. Planning decisions should support climate change mitigation and adaptation, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions, increasing resilience to climate impacts and directing development away from areas at unacceptable risk from flooding.
- Chapter 6: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes. Planning decisions should give substantial weight to providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community.
- Chapter 7: Building a strong, effective economy. Planning decisions should enable businesses to invest, expand and adapt in a way that reflects the opportunities, challenges and characteristics of different areas, and supports long-term economic growth both locally and nationally.
- Chapter 12: Making effective use of land. Planning decisions should give substantial weight to proposals that make more effective use of land and buildings, while maintaining good design, living conditions and local character. This includes redevelopment of previously developed, vacant, underused, contaminated or derelict sites, reuse of existing buildings, creation of additional homes through sensitive infill, upward extensions and development within existing plots. Higher-density development is also promoted within settlements in well-connected locations near public transport. Development that fails to make efficient use of land in accordance with the policy should be refused.
- Chapter 14: Achieving well-designed places. Development should be high quality, respect and enhance local character, deliver sustainable and attractive places, and accord with relevant design policies. Proposals that demonstrate good design and place-making should be supported, while those that fail to meet established design standards should be refused unless clearly justified.
- Chapter 18: Managing flood risk and coastal change. Development proposals should minimise risks to development arising from all sources of flooding and coastal change, taking into account the impacts of climate change, by steering development away from areas of risk, ensuring that development will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and incorporating sustainable drainage systems where appropriate.
- Chapter 19: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment: Development should conserve and enhance the natural environment by protecting important landscapes, habitats, biodiversity and trees, while maximising opportunities for nature recovery, green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain. Proposals should avoid significant environmental harm, prioritise land of lower environmental value where possible, and be sensitively designed in protected landscapes and coastal areas. Development causing unacceptable impacts on designated sites, irreplaceable habitats or biodiversity that cannot be adequately avoided, mitigated or compensated for should be refused.
 - In National Landscapes substantial weight should be placed on the importance of conserving and enhancing their natural beauty.
 - Decisions in Heritage Coast areas should be consistent with the special character of the area and the importance of its conservation
 - Improving the natural environment biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.

- Chapter 20: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment – Great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. Development that preserves or enhances designated or non-designated heritage assets should be approved. While any harm must be clearly justified and weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Proposals causing substantial harm to, or loss of, heritage assets should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where overriding public benefits outweigh the harm.

Other material considerations

National Planning Practice Guidance

Housing land supply

Dorset Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply as required by National Policy. In addition, the strategies for meeting housing needs in the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the housing need under the Government's standard method and therefore, in accordance with NPPF footnote 8, the housing policies within the adopted Development Plan(s) are out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. The emerging Dorset Local Plan is not sufficiently progressed and can be afforded very limited weight in decision making.

This does not result in automatic approval of residential development. Paragraph 11(d) requires that permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusal, or unless the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole.

Housing Delivery Test (HDT)

The latest HDT results (2025 measurement) show that insufficient homes have been delivered within the local plan area (88%) and that a local action plan is required.

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.

13. Public Benefits

The amendment to the scheme would facilitate the construction of 130 dwellings with appropriate flood resilience measures.

14. Planning Assessment

14.1 Principle of development

Principle of development

The principle of development has already been considered acceptable as part of the outline planning permission (ref. 2/2019/01799/OUT) for the construction of up to 130 dwellings on this site. The matters reserved at the outline stage were subsequently approved under reserved matters permission (ref. P/RES/2023/05768). The current application seeks consent for amendments to the approved planting plans and Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), which were approved as part of the reserved matters permission.

Design, landscaping, impact on character and appearance

The proposed amendments would not affect the approved built form or layout of the development.

The revisions have arisen through the detailed design work undertaken to discharge the drainage-related conditions attached to outline planning permission ref. 2/2019/01799/OUT. Following updates to the National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA), the latest surface water flood risk mapping indicates a greater extent of surface water flood risk affecting this site than was previously identified within the Outline and Reserved Matters applications. Consequently, additional drainage swales are required beyond those shown on the approved plans. Whilst these changes have no implications for the built environment, they necessitate revisions to the approved soft landscaping scheme.

The principal landscaping amendments comprise:

- Removal of existing hedgerow along the northern boundary (western side of the approved access), to be translocated to the rear of the drainage swale;
- Removal of section of existing hedgerow along the northern boundary (eastern side of the approved access);
- Removal of part of the existing shrub vegetation within the north-western corner of the site;
- Reconfiguration of approved tree planting along the northern boundary; and
- Introduction of additional native planting along the North, East and west boundaries;

Although the amendments result in the loss and relocation of some existing vegetation, they are necessary to accommodate the revised drainage strategy. The extent of change has been minimised where possible, and the scheme retains the approved number of tree planting across the site. Furthermore, significant additional native hedgerow planting is proposed to compensate for sections of hedgerow that would be removed. The translocation of the existing hedgerow will also help to retain a mature landscape character. Following comments received from the Landscape officer, revised plans were submitted to clearly show the proposed translocation and this removed the initial concerns and Landscape officer has since withdrawn their objection.

Overall, it is considered that the revised landscaping proposals would preserve the integrity of the approved landscape scheme and maintain the site's intended character and appearance, both when viewed from the road past the site and within it. The amendments are required to accommodate a revised drainage strategy and have been designed to minimise impacts on existing and proposed planting. As such, the changes are not considered to give rise to any unacceptable landscape or visual effects that would warrant refusal of the application.

Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties

As the proposed changes relate to landscaping alterations and do not affect the approved built form, layout, or relationship between dwellings, they are not considered to give rise to any unacceptable impacts on the living conditions of future residents or neighbouring occupiers.

Flood risk and drainage

As detailed within the sections above, the proposed alterations to the landscaping are to enable the required alterations to the drainage strategy following the updates to the National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA). This includes an increase in the swales around the site so that the surface water can be adequately managed.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have commented on this application raising no objection to the proposed extension to the surface water interception swale around the north of the site.

Highway impacts, safety, access and parking

The proposed alterations to the landscaping do not have an impact upon highway safety, access or parking. The removal of the hedges either side of the approved access would inevitably result in increased visibility for drivers leaving the site onto Station Road.

Impact on Trees/Hedges

The site is protected by an area Tree Preservation Order reference TPO/2020/0005. The proposed amendments to the landscaping scheme would not require the removal of any protected trees. The Council's Tree Officer was consulted on the application and raised no objection to the proposal, subject to agreement with the Landscape Officer's comments regarding the translocation of the hedgerow along the northern site boundary. The scheme has subsequently been amended to address these comments.

The Town Council has noted that: "It is understood that the proposed changes are to remove the western hedge completely and to strive to retain the eastern hedge albeit cut back to facilitate the drainage work. Whilst there is reference to Arboriculturist input required, on the amended planting plan, there appears to have been no further reference to this."

The annotation on the plan details in the first instance that: "Existing hedge to be removed to accommodate swale embankment..." The plans have been amended to align with the annotation by indicating that this application proposes the removal of this section of hedge. While the removal of this section of hedge is proposed, there would be no objection to the retention of any part of the hedgerow should this prove feasible during the implementation of the drainage swale works.

The proposal would result in the loss of approximately 29m of existing hedge, the proposed translocation of hedgerow (approx. 58m), together with substantial additional native hedgerow planting throughout the site (totalling 171m, including the translocated sections), is considered to provide appropriate mitigation. On this basis, the amended landscaping scheme is considered acceptable in arboricultural terms.

Biodiversity

As the proposed amendments involve the removal and alteration of existing vegetation and other ecological features, the applicant has submitted a revised Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) in support of the application. The Council's Natural Environment Team (NET) was consulted and initially raised a number of concerns requiring further clarification and amendment. In response, a revised LEMP was submitted, the contents of which have subsequently been reviewed and agreed by NET. Having regard to the submitted documents, it is considered that the proposed landscaping amendments would not give rise to any unacceptable impacts on biodiversity.

Summary of issues and the planning balance

The application seeks to vary conditions 1, 3 and 7 attached to the approved reserved matters permission to allow amendments to the approved planting plans and Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). The changes are required to facilitate revisions to the site's surface water drainage strategy following updated flood risk mapping and the need for additional drainage swales along the northern boundary of the site.

The principle of residential development is not under consideration, having already been established through the outline planning permission and subsequent reserved matters approval. The proposed amendments do not alter the approved number of dwellings, layout, scale, appearance, access arrangements or public open space provision.

The principal issues relate to the landscaping and ecological implications of the revised drainage works, particularly the removal and translocation of sections of existing hedgerow along the northern boundary. Whilst concerns were initially raised by the Council's Landscape Officer, Natural Environment Team and Stalbridge Town Council regarding the extent of hedgerow loss and clarity of the proposed mitigation, revised plans and a revised LEMP were submitted in response.

Following these amendments, the Landscape Officer has confirmed that the revised planting proposals, including the translocation of existing hedgerow and replacement planting, are acceptable. The Tree Officer has raised no objection, and the Natural Environment Team is satisfied that the revised LEMP adequately addresses biodiversity and ecological management requirements. The Lead Local Flood Authority similarly raises no objection

Although some existing vegetation would be lost, no protected trees would be affected, and the scheme includes substantial replacement native hedgerow planting and the translocation of retained hedgerow sections. The amendments are therefore considered to satisfactorily mitigate the landscape and ecological impacts arising from the revised drainage strategy.

Having regard to the approved status of the wider development, the absence of any significant material harm to visual amenity, residential amenity, highway safety, flood risk, trees or biodiversity, the proposed variation of conditions is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the North Dorset Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The loss and translocation of the hedgerow would give rise to a degree of adverse landscape impact in relation to the integration of the proposed development within its surroundings. This concern was identified by the Landscape Officer in their original consultation response and echoed by the Town Council, and therefore attracts limited weight against the proposal. However, substantial weight is afforded to the significant public benefits arising from the development, notably the delivery of 130 dwellings and the incorporation of appropriate flood resilience measures and the additional landscaping.

Having regard to the proposed mitigation, including the revised landscaping strategy and replacement hedgerow planting, the residual landscape impacts are not considered to significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. Accordingly, the proposed amendments are considered acceptable, and there are no material planning considerations that would warrant the withholding of planning permission. The application is therefore recommended for approval, subject to the conditions set out below.

The Town Council's comments have been duly considered throughout the determination of this application. Following the submission of revised plans, the Landscape Officer has withdrawn their objection, and the extent of works to the hedgerows along the northern boundary has been clarified.

Recommendation

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

A) grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos:

22085-PL-2-01 - Location Plan

22085-PL-2-02 F Site Layout

22085-PL-HT-2A_S-01 B House Type 2 Bed A - Semi - Brick

22085-PL-HT-2A_S-02 B House Type 2 Bed A - Semi - Flint

22085-PL-HT-2A_S-03 House Type 2 Bed A - Semi - Render

22085-PL-HT-2A_S-05 B House Type 2 Bed A - Semi - Half Render

22085-PL-HT-2A_T-01 B House Type 2 Bed A - Terrace - Brick

22085-PL-HT-2A_T-02 B House Type 2 Bed A - Terrace - Flint

22085-PL-HT-2B_S-01 B House Type 2 Bed B - Semi - Brick

22085-PL-HT-2C_S-01 B House Type 2 Bed C - Semi - Brick

22085-PL-HT-2C_S-02 B House Type 2 Bed C - Semi - Render
22085-PL-HT-2C_S-03 A House Type 2 Bed C - Semi - Render & Detailing
22085-PL-HT-3A_D-01 B House Type 3 Bed A - Detached - Brick
22085-PL-HT-3A_S-01 B House Type 3 Bed A - Semi - Brick
22085-PL-HT-3A_S-02 B House Type 3 Bed A - Semi - Flint
22085-PL-HT-3B_S-01 B House Type 3 Bed B - Semi - Brick
22085-PL-HT-3B_S-02 B House Type 3 Bed B - Semi - Render
22085-PL-HT-3B_S-03 B House Type 3 Bed B - Render & Detailing
22085-PL-HT-3B_S-04 B House Type 3 Bed B - Semi - Half Render
22085-PL-HT-3C_D-01 A House Type 3 Bed C V1 - Detached - Brick
22085-PL-HT-3C_D-02 B House Type 3 Bed C V1 - Detached - Flint
22085-PL-HT-3C_D-03 B House Type 3 Bed C V1 - Detached - Brick & Porch
22085-PL-HT-3C_D-04 B House Type 3 Bed C V2 - Detached - Brick
22085-PL-HT-3C_D-05 A House Type 2 Bed C V2 - Detached - Flint
22085-PL-HT-3C_D-06 A House Type 3 Bed C V1 - Detached - Flint & Porch
22085-PL-HT-3C_S-01 B House Type 3 Bed C V3 - House - Brick
22085-PL-HT-3C_S-02 B House Type 3 Bed C V3 - House - Render & Detailing
22085-PL-HT-4_D-01 B House Type 4 Bed - House - Brick
22085-PL-HT-4_D-02 B House Type 4 Bed - House - Flint
22085-PL-HT-CP-01 - Car Port A
22085-PL-2-03 G Site Layout - Tenure
22085-PL-2-04 E Site Layout - Bedrooms
22085-PL-2-05 H Site Layout - Building Materials
22085-PL-2-06 F Site Layout - Boundary Materials
22085-PL-2-07 F Site Layout - Parking & Bins
22085-PL-2-08 E Site Layout - Building Heights
22085-PL-2-09 Site Layout - LEAP Surveillance
23-024-002 E Refuse Vehicle Tracking
23-024-003 E Fire Tender Tracking
23-024-004 E Passenger Vehicle Tracking
23-024-005 H Highways General Arrangement
23-024-006 D Highway Contours & Geometry
23-024-007 A Highway Longitudinal Sections Sheet 1
23-024-008 A Highway Longitudinal Section Sheet 2
23-024-016 A Home Delivery Tracking
23-024-017 A Tanker Tracking
23-024-018 Highway General Arrangement & Highway Boundary
700 A Tree Constraints Plan
710 Tree Protection & Removal Plan
DD635L05 F Hard Landscaping Plan 1 of 4
DD635L06 E Hard Landscaping Plan 2 of 4
DD635L07 B Hard Landscaping Plan 3 of 4
DD635L07 B Hard Landscaping Plan 4 of 4
DD635D09 A Typical Tree Pit Details & Planting Bed Matrix Detail
DD636L10 A LEAP Play Scheme
DD635L01 F Planting Plan 1 of 4
DD635L02 L Planting Plan 2 of 4
DD635L03 H Planting Plan 3 of 4

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed in full accordance with the external facing materials for the walls and roofs shown on the approved plans and specified within the document entitled 'Material Specification' (received 27 January 2026), as approved under the discharge of conditions notice issued on 17 March 2026
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed in full accordance with the following soft landscaping plans and documents:
DD635L01 F Planting Plan 1 of 4
DD635L02 L Planting Plan 2 of 4
DD635L03 H Planting Plan 3 of 4
DD635L04 D Planting Plan 4 of 4
5011-RPS-XX-XX-DR-L-401 Rev P01 Typical Tree Pit Detail
Landscape and Ecological Management Plan – Ref: DD635 Rev G

The 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 soft landscaping shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed details and any trees or plants which, within a period of 10 years from the completion of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed in full accordance with the hard landscaping details shown on the plans and documents approved under the discharge of conditions notice issued on 15 May 2026.
5. The development hereby approved shall proceed only in accordance with the details set out in the Tree Survey Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment dated October 2023 setting out how the existing trees are to be protected and managed before, during and after development.
6. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed in full accordance with the means of enclosure details shown on the plan ref: SITE LAYOUT – BOUNDARY MATERIALS Ref: 22085-BR-2-04 - approved under the discharge of conditions notice issued on 15 May 2026.
7. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the recommendations and requirements in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan - Rev G - Dated 29.06.2026 and Technical Note: Updated Walkover dated March 2025.

The development hereby approved must not be first occupied unless and until:

- i) the recommendations detailed in the approved ecology report have been completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, and
- ii) evidence of compliance has been supplied to the Local Planning Authority prior to the substantial completion, or the first bringing into use of the development hereby approved, whichever is the sooner. The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the approved ecology report and thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.