

- 1.0**      **Application Number:** WP/19/00476/FUL  
**Site address:** Site of 8-10 Dorchester Road, Weymouth  
**Proposal:** Demolish Existing Dwellings and erect 3 no. blocks of flats (31 flats in total) with car parking, cycle and refuse storage  
**Applicant:** Mr P Briant  
**Case Officer:** Lachlan Robertson  
**Ward Member:** Cllr J Orrell

This application is brought to committee at the request of the Nominated Officer in accordance with section 134 of the Officer Scheme of Delegation, following representation received from the Town Council contrary to the officer recommendation and consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Ward members.

**2.0**      **Summary of Recommendation:**

- DELEGATE to Head of Planning to Grant Permission subject to the completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure an Affordable Housing Contribution of £87,500.00 index-linked using RPI from the date of this committee report, in lieu of on-site provision.

And subject to conditions as detailed below.

**3.0**      **Reason for the recommendation:**

- The proposal is generally in accordance with the Development Plan and provides additional housing, including an off-site contribution for affordable housing.
- The proposal is acceptable in terms of its design and general visual impact and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of the neighbouring listed building.
- There is not considered to be any significant adverse effect on neighbouring residential amenity.
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

**4.0**      **Table of key planning issues**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
Principle of development	The site lies within the defined development boundary where residential development can

	<p>contribute to the general need for housing and where a substantial, though lesser, redevelopment of the site has already been granted.</p>
Heritage Assets	<p>The development will have a significant impact on the appearance of this part of the Lodmoor Hill Conservation Area and on the setting of the adjacent Cranford House Grade II Listed Building. The CA is enhanced by the removal of an unsightly derelict property and by the insertion of new, prominent buildings at the front of the site in a style similar to other flat developments in the locality. The development will obscure the side elevation of the Listed Building but to no greater import than that likely under the previously approved scheme.</p>
Affordable Housing	<p>The applicant proposes that no affordable housing is provided on site, citing the viability of the development. The viability statement supplied by the applicant has been tested by the Council's advisers and they state that the financial viability of the scheme precludes providing the full 35% of Affordable Housing. In the interests of bringing a derelict site into economic productive use, it is considered that policy HOUS1 allows for an exception to be made.</p>
Scale, design, impact on local character, streetscape and appearance	<p>The proposal is compliant with policies ENV10, ENV11 and ENV12 where the scheme is considered to be in character with the site's surroundings and includes necessary facilities appropriate to the use.</p> <p>The overall streetscape is improved by the resulting removal of the existing derelict property and by an</p>

	improvement to the street view in comparison to the existing permission.
Impact on neighbouring privacy and amenity	The development will have an impact on the amenity and privacy of a greater number of neighbouring residential properties than that affected by the existing planning permission for flatted development. However, it is considered that the impact is to an acceptable degree taking into account similar development in the locality and the specific design and siting proposed.
Economic benefits	The proposal will provide an economic benefit by bringing a derelict building in a prominent location into more intensive residential use.
Access and Parking	There are no highway objections to the access and parking arrangements which are efficient and in accordance with standard requirements.
Land Ownership	Part of the site sought for development is currently disputed as to its ownership. This is a private matter and appropriate notices and certificates have been provided with the application. However, planning conditions require that the development is constructed as approved and as such the applicant will require appropriate land ownership/legal rights to carry out the development.
Landscaping	Care has been taken to retain the significant vegetation in the interests of the amenity of the adjoining property and the streetscape generally.

## 5.0 Description of Site

The site is currently occupied by a pair of semi-detached dwellings which have been derelict for a number of years. The site lies on the eastern side of Dorchester Road and between the Rembrandt Hotel and the Grade II listed building in residential use, Cranford House.

The site is about 0.2 hectares (0.54 acres) in size with a prominent frontage to Dorchester Road. Currently the appearance is of an overgrown garden to the front, with the derelict building set back in the manner of other properties in the street. The substantial rear garden is also overgrown. The proposed vehicular access is via Dorchester Road and College Lane, alongside the northern boundary of the site. The access also leads to a small car parking area used by the adjacent hotel.

The general area is an established mixed commercial and residential area comprising dwellings and modern flats which vary in their style and age. The rear of the property comprises a wall boundary beyond which is a hedge and beyond the hedge lies the grounds of Weymouth College. The southern boundary is shared with the grounds of Cranford House and a block of flats and their car parking area at Ricketts Close.

The existing garden is slightly raised above the level of the two existing blocks of flats to the southern side boundary and these flats are also close to the boundary with windows facing towards the site. The boundaries are mostly defined by stone and brick walls of varying heights and physical condition.

## 6.0 Description of Development

The proposal is for the construction of three blocks of flats, Two of which at the front of the site (Blocks A and B) are four storey high buildings with the 4<sup>th</sup> floor partially in the roof space. The third block (Block C) lies at the back of the site and would be three storeys in height, with the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor partially in the roof space. There would be a total of 31 flats in the scheme. During the course of considering the application, the agent amended the application from the original proposal for 33 flats.

Blocks A and Block B lie approximately in the position of the previously approved scheme for 16 flats. Block C is a new proposal to develop at the rear of the garden, adjacent to an existing block of flats at Ricketts Close.

The application specifies that the materials will be facing buff brick and red brick banding and red brick and buff brick banding under slate tile. Whilst in general

terms, brick and slate tile is an appropriate material in the light of the variety of similar materials to be found in the area, this is insufficiently precise. Therefore a suitable planning condition requiring full details of the external materials to be used, and which are therefore reserved for later approval, will be required.

Vehicular access is via College Lane and not directly from Dorchester Road. The site includes a variety of outbuildings and structures for cycle parking, bin stores and electric car recharging points.

A number of existing small trees are retained and with additional landscaping in the form of new tree planting to the front garden area and elsewhere within the site.

The accompanying Design and Access Statement from the applicant provides a summary of the proposal as follows:

*“11.1 The proposed development incorporates a larger site than the extant permission. The proposed development offers a higher quality development to the extant permission to enhance the quality and character of the Conservation Area. The break down in scale of development, improved articulation and design details with a greater level of soft landscaping to the front of the site is a far preferable scheme to the existing approved development.*

*11.2 The site is located within a very sustainable location, close to the town centre on a main transport corridor. The proposal includes ecology benefits that were missing in the extant permission. The proposal complies with the aims of both national and local planning policy, providing quality accommodation of a size and type suitable for the locality.”*

## 7.0 Relevant Planning History

Application No,	Proposal	Decision	Decision Date
WP/15/00704FUL	Demolition of existing dwellings and erection of a 3.5 storey block of 16 self-contained one and two bedroom apartments.	Approved	28/11/2018

## 8.0 List of Constraints

Within the built up area of Weymouth  
Partly within the Lodmoor Hill Conservation Area.

Adjacent to Cranford House which is a Grade II Listed Building described in the list as Weymouth Technical College (*reference SY6880SW DORCHESTER ROAD 873-1/16/71 (East side) Weymouth Technical College*).

Within the Conservation Area and as impacting upon the setting of a Listed Building, there is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets under the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

## 9.0 Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website. It should be noted that following the consultation replies, further information altering the position of the Blocks, the site area, car parking arrangements and ancillary changes were received. Where further consultation responses were sought and received, these are identified below.

**Historic England** have not commented.

**Natural England** makes no specific comment on the proposal either as original or as amended.

**The Highways Officer**, commenting on the original scheme stated that the use of College Lane for access, with other users, is a private matter. Improvements must be made to the internal layout (e.g. location of bin store for safety reasons, EV charging points).

In respect of the revised layout plan submitted, the **Highways Officer** is satisfied that the safety concerns have been addressed and notes the improved parking, though considers that there remains an amenity issue in respect of distance from the flats to the spaces.

**The Conservation Officer** stated that they are satisfied that the design has improved, though the street-scene could be improved by dropping Block A by one storey. This applies to both the original and the amended plans submitted.

**The Landscape Officer** comments that the massing of the buildings within this application is an improvement on the extant approval. There are no concerns regarding the proposed landscaping scheme and approval should be subject to the provision of a detailed landscaping condition.

**The Parks and Open Spaces Officer** has not commented

**The Housing Enabling Officer** states:

*“Although Housing Enabling acknowledges the submitted viability assessment the highest level of housing need in Weymouth and Portland is for affordable accommodation, provision on this development would assist in meeting that need. In order to comply with HOUS 1, we expect 35% of the homes developed on this site to be affordable and secured in perpetuity with a S106 agreement.”*

However, following discussion with the applicant in the light of a viability statement and assessment, the housing enabling officer states his acceptance of the provision of an off-site affordable housing contribution of £87,500.

**The Urban Design Officer** comments [original] that the proposals are a significant improvement on the extant scheme but agrees with the Conservation officer that Block A would be improved by a step-down. In addition it is stated:

*“Given that the architecture of the proposed scheme is more traditional, it is suggested that its appearance would be improved if design cues were taken from Cranford House to help add interest and more balance into the facade. For example, the form and roof shape of the bay windows, the brick banding and the scale and pattern of the windows - Cranford House incorporates 3 floors of windows of decreasing scale, ending with a small circular feature window which gives the façade balance as opposed to the 4 stories of similar design and scale of windows on the proposed scheme which will give the building façade a rather more cramped appearance.*

*The principle of the addition of Block C is acceptable. However the units are particularly small and although the DAS suggests that the communal lounge/ office compensates for this, it is highly unlikely that this room will be used by the occupants.*

*Taking into consideration the permission that already exists on the site, it is essential to ensure that the current scheme is worked with, rather than having to revert back to the extant permission. With some amendments to the design, the scheme would be considered to be an acceptable development on this site.”*

No further comments are made on the revised plans.

**The Flood Risk Management Team** state that the risk of flooding from surface water is considered to be low. A sustainable urban drainage scheme should be submitted. A drainage strategy should be submitted.

In respect of the additional drainage scheme subsequently provided, the FRMT states that this has not overcome their need for additional information.

Comments from the FRMT in respect of a further revised drainage strategy submitted by the applicant are awaited.

**The Planning Obligations Manager** has no comments in respect of CIL liability. It is considered that the applicant should confirm their right of way over the relevant section of College Lane.

**The Clinical Commissioning Group** have made no comment.

**The Dorset Police Crime Prevention Design Adviser** has examined the plans, spoken to the agent and has no further comment.

**The Streetscene Manager** have made no comment.

**Public Health Dorset** have made no comment.

**Wessex Water** have made no comment.

**The Weymouth Town Council** queries the density of the development and the mix of properties. In respect of the amended plans, a further comment is made that notes the *“slight increase in the number of parking spaces, but we still do not think this is adequate provision”*.

## 10.0 Representations

**Weymouth Civic Society** consider the proposal to be overdevelopment of this site, with an excessive number of flats and too high. There should be a visual link from Cranford House down to the level of the Rembrandt hotel.

As the two buildings are designed as a pair, the Civic Society would prefer both to be the same colour of brickwork – preferably buff or similar and are also concerned at the lack of parking. A reduction in the total number of flats should enable more appropriate provision.

The ‘studios’ are considered to have minimal space provision.

Twenty one individual objections have been received on the following grounds:

- The development is too dense and is a significant change to the character of the area. [This refers to both the original and the revised scheme.]
- Could potentially accommodate up to 82 people.
- There are only 22 [original] parking spaces for the 33 [original] flats. It should be 1.5 spaces per unit and allocated. Cycle spaces and public

transport are no substitute, even in a town centre location. Contrary to policy COM 9.

- The additional 2 spaces provided in the amended plans remains insufficient.
- Large vehicles (e.g. refuse, delivery, emergency services) will not be able to manoeuvre onsite.
- Access would interfere with existing users; particularly the hotel. College Lane is privately owned.
- Access should be made direct to Dorchester Road.
- The proposed limited parking will cause unauthorised parking along College Lane and Dorchester Road.
- The existing houses should be repaired and not demolished
- Photographs submitted to show view from adjacent dwelling overlooking the site towards Rembrandt Hotel and from front window to illustrate close proximity of new Block C.
- Block C will dominate the views from existing dwellings (flats 2, 5 & 8). [original] drawings inaccurately represent their windows.
- Block C will obstruct windows on adjoining properties and cause loss of light. [This applies to both the original and the revised plans].
- The 'single storey lean-to element' and 3 storey Block C will result in harm from loss of light and impact from dominance of the proposed building.
- There will be additional pressure on infrastructure.
- Potential for flooding from site to lower adjacent buildings, use of soakaways queried.
- The proposal [original] will result in the loss of trees in a Conservation Area.
- The land to the rear should be used as amenity land.
- No obvious eco-friendly features.
- A protected tree at the front would be lost.
- Agrees with the Conservation Officer's comments.
- There is knotweed on the site and should be removed.
- Disputes the ownership of land included in the amended plans but claimed to be in the ownership of the landowner of the site. This would prevent the implementation of the scheme: particularly in respect of car parking. The application should therefore be invalid.

Three individual supporting comments have been made on the following grounds:

- Generally supporting the principle of development.
- Supports Blocks A & B but not C.
- The amended plans showing the new fully single storey part is an improvement, but insufficient in itself to overcome all other objections.

## 11.0 Relevant Policies

The Development Plan  
West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015).

Policy INT1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
Policy ENV4 - Heritage Assets  
Policy ENV10 - The Landscape and Townscape Setting  
Policy ENV11 - The Pattern of Streets and Spaces  
Policy ENV12 - The Design and Positioning of Buildings  
Policy ENV13 - Achieving High Levels of Environmental Performance  
Policy ENV 15 - Efficient and Appropriate Use of Land  
Policy ENV 16 – Amenity  
Policy SUS 2 - Distribution of Development  
HOUS 1 - Affordable Housing  
HOUS 3 - Open Market Housing Mix  
HOUS 4 - Development of Flats, Hostels and Houses in Multiple Occupation  
COM 9 - Parking Standards in New Development

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 sets out the government's policies on a wide range of planning subjects, to which the Development Plan policies are generally in compliance. As the site is partially within a Conservation Area and affects the setting of the adjacent Cranford House listed building, there are relevant NPPF and development plan policies which may over-ride the general presumption in favour of development (NPPF paragraph 11(d)(i)).

Paragraph 192 states that local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Furthermore, para 127 states that decisions should ensure that developments: *“c)are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);”*

Relevant sections of the NPPF

2. Achieving sustainable development
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
11. Making effective use of land
12. Achieving well-designed places
16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

## 12.0 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.

### 13.0 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 PSED.

### 14.0 Financial benefits

<b>Material benefits of the proposed development</b>	
Affordable housing	The financial viability of the proposal has been independently tested and the applicant has accepted that whilst the proposal is unable to viably provide for the required 35% affordable housing provision, it can viably contribute to the affordable needs of the area by providing a sum of £87,500 for use in bringing forward other affordable housing schemes in the town
CIL contributions	c. £124,000

<b>Non-material benefits of the proposed development</b>	
Council Tax	Not known at this stage
New Homes Bonus	Not known at this stage

### 15.0 Climate Implications

There is no specific information provided on the degree to which the project will be carbon neutral. However, the scheme will include Electric Vehicle points. The location of the flats within the town will provide some benefits by reducing the need for some carbon based travel movements.

## 16.0 Planning Assessment

### Principle of development

The site lies within the defined development boundary where residential development is normally acceptable, subject to policy considerations set out in the West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015).

The site is currently in residential use and a previous planning permission has settled the principle that a more intensive residential use on the site can be established. The consideration of the principle of the development therefore lies in the manner in which the proposal increases the amount of development from the previously approved 16 units to 31.

The proposal contributes to the general need for housing and is therefore in accordance with the national policy for increasing the housing supply and in accordance with policy INT1 of the Local Plan.

### Heritage Assets

The development will have a significant impact on the appearance of this part of the Lodmoor Hill Conservation Area. The street frontage will substantially change from its present appearance of a pair of domestic dwellings to a development of two large blocks of flats which are similar in scale to the adjacent Cranford House.

The Conservation Area would be enhanced by the removal of the currently unsightly derelict properties. The design of the blocks are of a scale and type that can be found elsewhere in the Conservation Area.

As in the case of the previously approved scheme, the setting of the adjacent Cranford House Grade II Listed Building is significantly affected. The siting of the blocks in both the previous and the current schemes will obscure the side elevation. However, this elevation is considered to be of secondary importance to the overall qualities of the Listed Building where the main architectural interests lies to the front which is unaffected by the development.

The Design and Access Statement says that: *“the proposed re-design has considered the setting of the adjacent listed building and the wider character of the Conservation Area. In comparison to the extant consent, the proposal will better reveal and enhance the significance of the setting of the heritage asset*

*and appear more subservient in nature. The principle of the loss of the existing buildings has been accepted with the grant of the extant consent.”*

Whilst the Conservation Officer offers the view that a reduction in the scale of proposed Block A would improve the transition from the larger scale Cranford House to the lower scale Rembrandt Hotel, the fact that the earlier scheme proposes no such transition is a material consideration against the suggestion.

The harm caused by loss of the existing buildings and redevelopment was considered to be substantial at the time of the previously approved scheme. This was considered to be acceptable when weighed against the poor structural condition of the buildings, the cost and viability of redevelopment and the public benefit of bringing the site back into residential use and removal of the unsightly buildings in the Conservation Area. The harm caused by the current scheme is considered to be a reduction to the extant permission which is a material consideration and therefore similar weight to the impacts and public benefits of the development are applicable.

#### Affordable Housing

The applicant proposes that no affordable housing is provided on site, citing the viability of the development.

A *Viability Statement* has been supplied by the applicant using specialists S106 *Affordable Housing* who set out in detail how the costs and values generated by the development do not support the provision of affordable housing.

This *Viability Statement* has been tested by the Council's advisers who in turn state that they agree that the financial viability of the scheme precludes providing the full 35% of Affordable Housing as required by policy.

However, the Council's advisers state that; *“the scheme is capable of providing an element of affordable housing on site”*. The advisers go on to establish the level of affordable housing that would be viable and this is established as the provision of either two on-site affordable housing units or an off-site contribution of £87,500.

The applicant, whilst taking issue with some of the details, nevertheless has agreed with the conclusions of this assessment.

The Council's enabling officer has advised that the provision of two units on site would not in his view be functionally viable for this type of flatted scheme in this area. There are schemes in the town that could be assisted in being brought forward by means of this contribution.

It is considered that policy HOUS1 allows for such an exception to be made. The contribution would require the provision of a suitable S106 Agreement.

#### Scale, design, impact on local character, streetscape and appearance

This part of Weymouth is characterised by a variety of residential, commercial and other uses which is reflected in the variety of styles that make up the local streets and this part of the Conservation Area. Blocks A and B are designed with features that nod in the direction of the Victorian villa style and also of the adjacent Cranford House, though they will appear modern in execution and detailing.

Block C to the rear will appear as another in-depth development of flats similar to the adjacent, existing block.

It is considered that the proposal is compliant with policy ENV10 in that it is “informed” by the character of the area. Where possible, existing small trees are kept.

The proposal is in accordance with policy ENV11 where the external spaces are well defined, their purpose clear and where movement across the spaces is convenient and safe. Facilities for bin stores and similar operational facilities are proposed.

The proposal is for the reason set out above also compliant with ENV12 where the scheme is considered to be in character with the site’s surroundings and includes necessary facilities appropriate to the use.

The overall streetscape is improved by the resulting removal of the existing derelict property and by an improvement to the street view in comparison to the existing permission.

#### Impact on neighbouring privacy and amenity

Policy ENV16 seeks to minimize the impact of the development on the amenity and privacy of existing and future residents. As this is a major concern of local residents, the relevant parts of the policy are quoted here in full and then addressed.

It should be borne in mind that the previously approved scheme has an impact only upon the residential use of Cranford House and, as a large single building, close to its boundary, would have affected the outlook and indirect light to those properties with windows on the side elevation. Block B is in a similar position with similar impact. However, the proposed Block C will be a new introduction into the

area and thus affect the flats behind Cranford House where no effect would have occurred under the previous permission.

Policy ENV16	Proposal	Privacy and Amenity Objection	Planning Officer Assessment
<p>[Permitted if, the proposals ] <i>do not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of occupiers of residential properties through <b>loss of privacy</b></i></p>	<p>Block B side on to Cranford House uses obscure or partially glazed fenestration to service areas, bedrooms or bathrooms.</p> <p>Block C is side on to the flats at Ricketts Lane and has windows only at ground level.</p>	<p>No specifically identified objection from residents of Cranford House.</p> <p>Whilst objectors do not specifically cite loss of privacy, it is reasonable to consider their amenity in that respect given the proximity of window to window relationships at ground level.</p>	<p>Cranford House: The currently approved scheme would have had secondary windows to principal living rooms in approximately the same relationship. No obscure glazing.</p> <p>The proposed new Block B has a more complex internal form with a variety of different windows. The use of obscure glazing will, on balance, be an improvement to the currently approved arrangement.</p> <p>The proposed new Block C is not considered to have an unreasonable impact on the privacy of the Ricketts Lane properties as windows are limited to the ground level and there is a reasonable distance between the blocks at that point.</p>
<p>[Permitted if the proposals] <i>do not have a</i></p>	<p>Block C is side on to the flats at Ricketts Lane</p>	<p>There are a number of substantial objections from</p>	<p>The existing properties are close to the southern</p>

<p><i>significant adverse effect on the amenity of the occupiers of properties through <b>inadequate daylight or excessive overshadowing, overbearing impact or flicker</b></i></p>	<p>and is forward of the front “building line” of that existing development. The agent has drawn sight lines on the amended site plan to illustrate the effect of the building.</p>	<p>residents of Ricketts Lane properties, including the submission of photographic evidence that the building will impinge on their views and overshadow their living areas.</p>	<p>boundary of the site and windows on all levels will, to some degree, receive less indirect light as a result of the development. However, most of the side facing, existing windows are north-west facing and located looking over the single storey part of Block C.</p> <p>The positioning of Block C and the design of its overall form, has sought to minimise impact and is located further away from the windows of its neighbour than the previous scheme’s relationship with Cranford House.</p>
---	---	--	---

In summary, the development will have an impact on the amenity and privacy of a greater number of neighbouring residential properties than that affected by the existing planning permission for flatted development. However, it is considered that the impact is to an acceptable degree taking into account similar development in the locality and the specific design and siting proposed.

Economic benefits

The proposal will provide an economic benefit by bring a derelict building in a prominent location into more intensive residential use. The required contribution for affordable housing will have a positive impact of assisting such schemes in the local area.

Access and Parking

There are no highway objections to the access and parking arrangements in principle which are efficient and in accordance with standard requirements.

Though the Highways officer would have preferred better arrangements for amenity reasons. Whilst this is noted, the requirements for parking are clearly stated and have been complied with.

The applicant has a right of access using College Lane onto private courtyards for access and parking.

### Land Ownership

Part of the site sought for development, in the vicinity of the Rembrandt Hotel's car park, is currently disputed as to its ownership. This is a private matter and appropriate notices and certificates have been provided with the application. However, planning conditions require that the development is constructed as approved and as such the applicant will require appropriate land ownership/legal rights to carry out the development.

### Landscaping

The proposals in this respect are simple in nature and involve the retention of a significant tree in the front garden and a number of minor trees next to the amenity area for Cranford House. Additional small trees are proposed, though there will be a need to provide further details by planning condition to ensure they are suitable in close proximity to the buildings.

## **17.0 Conclusion**

The planning issues in this case are finely balanced insofar as the proposal can be considered against the relative merits of the existing planning permission for 16 flats. On the one hand, the existing permission provided for affordable housing on-site, fewer dwellings, with less impact on existing residents adjacent to the rear of the site.

On the other hand the proposed Blocks A and B, in contrast, are a considerable improvement on the appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Building. But they will impact on the amenity of residents at the Ricketts Lane development more.

The proposal; whilst it does not provide the full provision of affordable housing on site, will nevertheless make a contribution to affordable housing in the town.

Access via College Lane is preferable to direct access onto the Dorchester Road and the internal arrangements for operational space and car parking are in accordance with published standards.

The proposals are considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**DELEGATE TO HEAD OF PLANNING TO GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO THE COMPLETION OF A LEGAL AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 106 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED) TO SECURE AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION OF £87,500.00 INDEX-LINKED USING RPI FROM THE DATE OF THIS COMMITTEE REPORT, IN LIEU OF ON-SITE PROVISION.**

**AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS AND REASONS:**

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

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

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

2018-18-21 Rev.C -	Block & Location Plans
2018-18-22 Rev.C -	Site Plan
2018-18-23 Rev.A -	Blocks A & B Floor Plans
2018-18-24 -	Block A Elevations
2018-18-25 Rev.B -	Block B Elevations
2018-18-27 Rev.B -	Street Elevations
2018-18-28 Rev.A -	Bin & Cycle Stores
2018-18-29 -	Plans of Existing Building
2018-18-30 -	Elevations of Existing Building
2018-18-33 Rev.A -	Block C Floor Plans & Elevations
2018-18-34 -	Drainage Strategy

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

3. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the make, type and colour of all materials to be used externally on each part of the development, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out using the approved materials.

REASON: To ensure that the materials are clearly specified.

4. Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, the access, turning and parking, cycle parking and bin store facilities shown on Drawing Number 2018-18-22 must have been constructed. Thereafter, these must be

maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

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

5. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of all hard and soft landscaping, including ground surface area materials, the species and size of tree planting and the protection measures to be employed for existing trees as shown of the approved site plan 2018-18-22 rev C, shall be provided to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All hard and soft landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: Landscaping is considered essential in order to preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality.

6. The obscure glazing as shown on the approved plan for Block C, reference 2018-18-33A shall be installed prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and shall be kept as obscure glazing at all times thereafter.

REASON: In the interests of the privacy and amenity of residents.

7. A historical record of the house and grounds at No.8 and No.10, including the interior and exterior of the buildings, shall be carried out and submitted to the Local Planning Authority and shall include photographs and plans to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, prior to demolition commencing.

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