

APPLICATION PROPOSAL	Demolish existing dwellings and erect a food store with associated access, parking and landscaping.		
ADDRESS	76-78 Ringwood Road, Verwood, BH31 7AJ		
RECOMMENDATION	– Grant, subject to condition (see Section 9 of the report for the full recommendation)		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE	The nominated officer has requested that the application be determined by committee due to the public interest in the application and the potential impact on neighbouring amenity		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise • The proposal is not considered to harm the viability or vitality of Verwood Town Centre • The location is considered acceptable and the proposal is considered acceptable in its design and general visual impact. • There is not considered to be detrimental harm to neighbouring residential amenity that would warrant refusal • There are no other material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application 		
INFORMATION ABOUT FINANCIAL BENEFITS OF PROPOSAL	<p><u>The following are considered to be material to the application:</u></p> <p>Contributions to be secured through Section 106 legal agreement: N/A</p> <p>Contributions to be secured through CIL: £166,480.30 (approx. calculation only, final amount TBC).</p> <p>Net increase in numbers of jobs: approximately 40 employees in a combination of both part and full-time positions</p> <p>Estimated increase/ reduction in average annual workplace salary spend in District through net increase/decrease in numbers of jobs: N/A</p>		
APPLICANT	Lidl	AGENT	Mr Chris Tookey
WARD	Verwood	PARISH/ TOWN COUNCIL	Verwood
PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE	12 th August 2020	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE	January 2020

DECISION DUE DATE	20 th Nov 2019	EXT. OF TIME	7 th October 2020
--------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
03/436986/HIST	Use Land For Displays And Sale Of Caravans	Approved	15 April 1971
Reasons for refusal: N/A			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
3/13/0464/FUL	Erection of 64 bedroom care home (Use Class C2), with associated access, parking and landscaping as amended by plans received 25th July 2013	Refused	12 Nov 2013
Reasons for refusal (in summary):			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Building - unsympathetic and inappropriate in style, scale and bulk, cramped and incongruous in appearance. Hardstanding - visually prominent combined with loss of oak tree and limited landscaping opportunities. Contrary to Policies DES8 and HODEV3 of the East Dorset Local Plan (EDLP) and para 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework(NPPF)</i> • <i>Bulk, scale, mass and design, would have an overbearing relationship to adjacent residential properties, with overlooking/perceived overlooking and loss of privacy. Contrary to Policy DES8 of the EDLP and NPPF.</i> • <i>Removal of Oak Tree (T12) would adversely impact visual amenities of the locality, mitigation planting would not sufficiently replace the amenity lost. Contrary to Policies DES5 and DES7 of the EDLP and policy HE3 of the emerging Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (CS).</i> • <i>Inadequate justification provided to justify the loss of such an important tree and benefits of development do not outweigh the tree's loss. Contrary to Paragraph 118 of the NPPF.</i> • <i>No commitment to provide a SE Dorset Transport contribution through a Planning Obligation. No evidence to demonstrate that the development would not exacerbate transport problems in South East Dorset. Contrary to the NPPF, CIL Regulation 122, Policy Trans14 of the EDLP and Policy KS11 of the emerging CS.</i> 			

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1.01 The application site is a 0.64ha area of land, mainly hardstanding, which is in use as a caravan storage area (accommodating over 125 caravans), but also includes two residential properties, Nos. 76 and 78 Ringwood Road.
- 1.02 The site is located between Ringwood Road and Crescent Road in Verwood. Its northern, and part of its southern, boundaries respectively adjoin those two parts of the public highway. Its western, eastern, and part of its southern, boundaries run alongside residential properties, which are themselves variously located at Ringwood Road, Heathlands Close, Crescent Road, Shard Close and Newtown Road. Access to the site is from Ringwood Road only.
- 1.03 The site is located within the main urban area of Verwood and within 400m of the internationally protected heathland, Verwood Heath. Verwood Town Centre is located approximately 650m to the west, along Ringwood Road.
- 1.04 The site is largely flat and contains no features apart from a number of mature trees which are located on the peripheries of the site and within adjacent properties. At the southern end of the site are several trees the subject of Tree Preservation Orders. There are no other structures on the site other than the fore mentioned dwellings at numbers 76 and 78.
- 1.05 The site does not include any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation or archaeological designations, nor is it located within the floodplain.
- 1.06 The character of the area to Ringwood Road is mixed with both residential development and commercial, including a petrol station and car dealership opposite. The area comprises both single and two storey structures and a three storey mixed-use development located at the junction of Ringwood Road and Black Hill to the south east of the application site.
- 1.07 The character of the area to Crescent Road is residential and comprises mostly single storey dwellings with well vegetated frontages close to the application site and some two storey dwellings in the wider area.
- 1.08 The character of the area to Heathlands Road is also residential and comprises single storey red brick dwellings with open frontages.
- 1.09 Shard Close is an unmade road which provides access to the rear of properties fronting Crescent Road and front access to properties backing on to Ringwood Road. Dwellings here are single storey.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.01 This is a full planning application to:

‘Demolish existing dwellings and erect a food store with associated access, parking and landscaping’

2.02 This planning application proposes the demolition of the existing two dwellings and the redevelopment of the site through the construction of a supermarket and associated development, including parking, manoeuvring, and loading areas, plant, boundary treatment, lighting, and landscaping.

2.03 The proposed retail building would be a detached structure occupying the southern half of the site and the parking area would be located at the northern end. Access is proposed from Ringwood Road through the existing site entrance, which would be modified to make it suitable to serve the proposal. The building would have a gross internal area of 1700sqm in area, of which 1172sqm would be given over to sales space. The remaining internal area would be given over to, amongst other things, storage, staff facilities, a chiller and freezer areas.

2.04 Externally, the building would have a flat and mono-pitched roof rising to a maximum height of around 6.8m towards the eastern side of the building. The lower, length of flat roof would run from the northern to the southern end of the building on its eastern side, adjacent to the boundary with 19 Crescent Road.

2.05 The proposed cladding materials would comprise glazing (including full height curtain wall glazing), red brick, timber cladding and silver metal cladding.

2.06 An external plant area would be located alongside the building’s eastern elevation (adjacent to 19 Crescent Road), whilst a covered trolley area would be located at the northern end of the eastern elevation (also adjacent to 19 Crescent Road). A loading bay and associated access ramp would be located at the northern end of the building’s western elevation (adjacent to 3 Heathlands Close). The parking area would include 79 parking spaces, including 6 disabled spaces and 6 parent/child spaces. 14 cycle parking stands are also proposed.

2.07 The application is supported by the following technical documents:

- Design, and Access Statement
- Retail Impact Assessment
- Ecological Appraisal
- Tree Survey
- Landscaping Details
- Lighting Assessment
- Energy Report
- Drainage Documentation
- Noise Impact Assessment

- Transport Assessment

3.0 SUMMARY OF INFORMATION

3.01 A number of revised designs have been submitted throughout the planning process comprising changes in response to consultee comments. The following is a summary of the proposed scheme as amended which has been assessed.

	Initial Design	Proposed
Site Area (ha)	0.64 ha	0.64 ha
Use	A1 (shops)*	A1 (shops)*
Floor Area	Total GIA – 1800m ² Sales area – 1172m ²	Total GIA – 1700m ² Sales area – 1172m ²
Length	69.5m	67m
Width	33m	32.5m
Approximate Ridge Height (m)	From FFL – 5-7m From GFL - 5-7m	From FFL – 5-6.8m From GFL – 4-5.8m
Materials	render, metal cladding, glazing	Brick, timber cladding, metal cladding, glazing
Parking Spaces	87 vehicle parking 12 cycle parking	79 vehicle parking 12 cycle parking
No. of Storeys	Single storey	Single storey
Distance from neighbouring boundaries	West – 3-6m East – 1m-6m South – 2-6m	West – 4.2-7m East – 1m-6m South – 8-23m

*[Officer note: While the A1 shops is now class E (commercial business and service) As amended 1st September 2020 under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020, there is a material transitional period until 31st July 2021 where the former use class is still referred to].

3.02 It is noted the proposed design has not reduced the floor area significantly, however the following changes have been made to improve the relationship of the proposed with the surrounding context:

- Main building repositioned to avoid impact on the protected oak tree
- Protected oak tree retained
- Car parking area reduced (as a result of repositioning)

- Materials changed to include brick and timber cladding and render removed
- Separation distances to neighbouring boundaries improved to the south and west
- Overall height reduced by approx. 1m with the a change to floor levels

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

- Ringwood Road - B road
Heathland 400m consultation zone and 400m-5km Consultation Area
- SSSI Impact Risk Zone
- Main Urban Area - Verwood
- Contaminated Land - Clay brick & tiles [manufacture]
- Tree Preservation Orders on and near the site - TPO Ref: VE/272, Group Ref: T3 , TPO Ref: VE/74, Group Ref: G1 , TPO Ref: VE/272, Group Ref: T2 , Tree Preservation Order - TPO Ref: VE/287, Group Ref: T1 , TPO Ref: VE/272, Group Ref: T1

5.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5.01 Development Plan:

Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (Part 1) 2014 (CS)

The following policies are of relevance in this case:

The Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (2014) ("the Core Strategy")

Policy HE2 - Design of New Development
Policy HE3 – Landscape Quality
Policy HE4 – Open Space Provision
Policy KS1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Policy KS6 – Town Centre Hierarchy
Policy KS7 – Role of Town and District Centres
Policy KS8 – Future Retail Provision
Policy KS11 - Transport and Development
Policy KS12 - Parking Provision
Policy ME1 – Safeguarding Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Policy ME2 - Protection of the Dorset Heathland
Policy ME4 – Renewable Energy Provision
Policy ME6 – Flood Management, Mitigation, and Defence

The East Dorset Local Plan (2002) ("the Local Plan")

Policy DES2 - Pollution
Policy DES11 - Enhancing the Environment
Policy LTDEV1 – External Lighting
Policy WENV4 – Development in Relation to Rivers and their Tributaries

5.02 Supplementary Planning Guidance

Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD 2020-2025

5.03 Government Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

6.01 In addition to letters to neighbouring properties, a site notice was posted outside the site on the 25 September 2019 with an expiry date for consultation 24 days after from the date of the notice. Neighbours were also reconsulted by letter for the revised design on 4 April and 11 June 2020. Minor amendments relating to tree and landscape matters only were submitted in August 2020. These changes did not necessitate a full reconsultation where the south east corner of the proposed building was reduced to avoid impact on the protected oak tree, tree species were revised and additional trees were added to the car park area. Therefore impacts did not extend beyond the site and improved landscaping for the proposed.

6.02 In total, 49 letters of objection from 43 addresses were received raising the following issues:

	INITIAL DESIGN (September 2019)	REVISED DESIGN (April 2020)	REVISED DESIGN (June 2020)
Location/ Principle	There are more suitable sites, such as Ebblake Industrial Estate and the proposal would be harmful to existing retail outlets.	There are more suitable sites, such as Ebblake Industrial Estate and the proposal would be harmful to existing retail outlets. Site is not suitable. There are already Lidl storeys in Ferndown and Ringwood, so one is not needed in Verwood. Site is not in a 'business park' setting so is not suitable for the use and is only suitable for an	There are more suitable sites, such as Ebblake Industrial Estate and the proposal would be harmful to existing retail outlets. Change of use is inconsistent with the adopted Local Plan and core strategy. No other suitable sites have been offered up. Too close to a school Site is not suitable. Site is not in a 'business park' setting so is not suitable for the use and is only suitable for an

		<p>industrial estate.</p> <p>Site is set away from main local shopping areas.</p> <p>Site is just over 800m from edge of town centre and it is unlikely that the proposal will generate any linked trips to Verwood town centre.</p> <p>There are already supermarkets in Verwood, so another is not needed.</p>	<p>industrial estate.</p> <p>Site is set away from main local shopping areas.</p> <p>There are already supermarkets in Verwood, so another is not needed.</p>
Design	<p>The site is too small to accommodate the proposed supermarket</p> <p>The height of the proposal in relation to surrounding properties</p>	<p>The site is too small to accommodate the proposed supermarket</p> <p>Form of the proposal in terms of its layout and siting within the site is not suitable.</p> <p>Footprint of building is not set back enough from boundaries.</p> <p>Proposal does not meet policy HE2.</p>	<p>The height of the proposal in relation to surrounding properties.</p> <p>The site is too small to accommodate the proposed supermarket</p> <p>Form of the proposal in terms of its layout and siting within the site is not suitable.</p> <p>Footprint of building is not set back enough from boundaries.</p> <p>Proposal does not meet policy HE2.</p>
Impact on character of the area	<p>The design of the building would not be in keeping with the character of the area</p> <p>Harmful effects of signage</p>	<p>The design of the building would not be in keeping with the character of the area.</p> <p>Harmful effects of signage and illuminated signage.</p> <p>Proposal is less invasive and more suitable than previous</p>	<p>2m high fence enclosing the site will further degrade the local residential environment with the site appearing to be a stockade.</p> <p>Development would be an 'eyesore'.</p> <p>The design of the building would not be in</p>

		<p>nursing home proposal.</p> <p>Proposal does not meet policy HE2.</p>	<p>keeping with the character of the area.</p> <p>Harmful effects of signage and illuminated signage.</p> <p>Proposal is less invasive and more suitable than previous nursing home proposal.</p> <p>Proposal does not meet policy HE2.</p>
Neighbouring amenity	<p>Noise disturbance to neighbours, in relation to garden and internal living areas, from the general use of the site, slamming car doors, deliveries, vehicle engines, and plant.</p> <p>Air pollution from fumes.</p> <p>Light pollution.</p> <p>Anti-social behaviour within the car park area outside opening hours</p> <p>Overbearing effects and loss of outlook in relation to neighbouring properties located alongside the proposed development</p> <p>Loss of privacy for neighbours</p> <p>Inadequate</p>	<p>Acoustic Assessment only considers the impact of the mechanical plant, and there is no assessment of other potential noise disturbance from vehicles and deliveries, which needs to be assessed.</p> <p>Close proximity of service yard, car park, plant area and building to existing residential properties.</p> <p>Concerns that some construction and /or ongoing maintenance work will take place at night resulting in harmful noise disturbance to neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>No start/end times available with regards to construction works.</p> <p>Health concerns over waste disposal.</p> <p>Loss of acceptable normal living</p>	<p>Acoustic Assessment fails to provide an acoustic assessment of the proposal with survey information (including existing and proposed, and current background noise levels).</p> <p>Concerns that the means of escape gate in Crescent Road would result in staff and customers parking in the road</p> <p>No evidence that a 2m high fence enclosing the site will reduce noise impact upon neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>Concerns over safety measures due to COVID-19.</p> <p>Acoustic Assessment only considers the impact of the mechanical plant, and there is no assessment of other potential noise disturbance from vehicles and deliveries, which needs to be</p>

	<p>landscaping and noise screening proposed</p>	<p>conditions for neighbours.</p> <p>Concerns that the works could result in flooding of nearby properties with lower ground levels, affecting neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>Noise disturbance to neighbours, in relation to garden and internal living areas, from the general use of the site, slamming car doors, deliveries, vehicle engines and plant.</p> <p>Air pollution from fumes and from plant and impacts to school children waiting for transportation.</p> <p>Light pollution.</p> <p>Anti-social behaviour within car park area outside opening hours, and by non-shoppers.</p> <p>Overbearing effects and loss of outlook in relation to neighbouring properties located alongside proposed development.</p> <p>Loss of privacy for neighbours, including concerns over whether some windows are obscure glazed.</p> <p>Inadequate landscaping & noise screening of proposed.</p>	<p>assessed.</p> <p>Close proximity of service yard, car park, plant area and building to existing residential properties.</p> <p>Concerns that some construction and /or ongoing maintenance work will take place at night resulting in harmful noise disturbance to neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>No start/end times available with regards to construction works.</p> <p>Health concerns over waste disposal.</p> <p>Loss of acceptable normal living conditions for neighbours.</p> <p>Loss of natural daylight for neighbours from building and boundary treatment (fence height).</p> <p>Concerns that the works could result in flooding of nearby properties with lower ground levels, affecting neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>Noise disturbance to neighbours, in relation to garden and internal living areas, from the general use of the site, slamming car doors, deliveries, vehicle engines and plant.</p> <p>Air pollution from fumes</p>
--	---	---	---

			<p>and from plant and impacts to school children waiting for transportation.</p> <p>Light pollution.</p> <p>Anti-social behaviour within car park area outside opening hours, and by non-shoppers.</p> <p>Overbearing effects and loss of outlook in relation to neighbouring properties located alongside proposed development.</p> <p>Loss of privacy for neighbours, including concerns over whether some windows are obscure glazed.</p> <p>Inadequate landscaping & noise screening of proposed.</p>
<p>Access, Traffic and Parking</p>	<p>Harmful traffic impacts and highway safety issues, including in relation to cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Conflict in relation to traffic between the proposal and the neighbouring petrol station, garage, and shops.</p> <p>The proposal would not include sufficient parking capacity or adequate junction design to serve the development.</p>	<p>Ref to Exigo letter - which has identified significant flaws in the assessment and demonstrates that the application significantly underestimates the effect of the proposed development on the highway network.</p> <p>Request that DC Highways reconsider their recommendation of 'no objection.'</p> <p>Harmful traffic impacts (including increase in traffic in nearby and surrounding areas) and highway safety</p>	<p>Ringwood Road is the busiest road in Verwood.</p> <p>The entrance to the site would cause problems with oncoming vehicles from both directions, as well as pedestrians.</p> <p>Reference to more harmful traffic impacts outside food stores elsewhere in Dorset.</p> <p>Harmful traffic impacts (including increase in traffic in nearby and surrounding areas) and highway safety issues, including in relation to</p>

		<p>issues, including in relation to cyclists and pedestrians (including from the school).</p> <p>Conflict in relation to traffic between the proposal and neighbouring petrol station, garage, shops and traffic lights.</p> <p>The proposal would not include sufficient parking capacity or adequate junction design to serve development.</p>	<p>cyclists and pedestrians (including from the school).</p> <p>Conflict in relation to traffic between the proposal and neighbouring petrol station, garage, shops and traffic lights.</p> <p>The proposal would not include sufficient parking capacity or adequate junction design to serve development.</p>
Drainage	There may be surface water drainage issues	<p>Concerns that the works could result in flooding of nearby properties with lower ground levels.</p> <p>Drainage concerns with regards to neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Concerns that the works could result in flooding of nearby properties with lower ground levels.</p> <p>Drainage concerns with regards to neighbouring properties.</p>
Trees	Negative impact on protected trees	<p>Negative impact on protected and mature trees (including a 200-year old oak tree).</p> <p>Loss of mature trees.</p>	<p>Would like Lidl to agree to the safe retention of the oak in the south corner of the site?</p> <p>Negative impact upon TPO. Proposal is too close to the root system and will eventually destroy the tree.</p> <p>Loss of dense group of trees to the rear of 78 Ringwood Road, and directly behind 21 Crescent Road.</p> <p>Negative impact on protected and mature trees (including a 200-year old oak tree).</p>

			Loss of mature trees.
Ecology/ Climate Change		Concerns over impact to bats using the area as a bat fly route.	
Setting of nearby historic buildings, Listed Buildings & Scheduled Monuments		Harm to existing remaining cob and thatched cottages in Verwood. Harmful impact on setting of listed building	Harm to Stephen's Castle which is an ancient monument Harm to existing remaining cob and thatched cottages in Verwood. Harmful impact on setting of listed building
Construction		Concerns that the works and machinery would damage neighbouring properties, including vibration damage.	Comment that the infrastructure might not be in place to support future development e.g. housing. Concerns that the works and machinery would damage neighbouring properties, including vibration damage.
Retail Impact		Concerns that the assumptions in the retail impact assessment are unsubstantiated, and that the impact on existing retail businesses in the area has been significantly underestimated and will be adverse. Unsubstantiated assumptions about where the new Lidl store would divert trade from. The figure is too high. Question whether there is any significant leakage of expenditure from	Concerns that the assumptions in the retail impact assessment are unsubstantiated, and that the impact on existing retail businesses in the area has been significantly underestimated and will be adverse. Footfall would be too low and therefore not sustainable. Would have a negative impact upon the High Street. Click and collect, home deliveries mean that

		<p>Verwood to Ferndown or Ringwood.</p> <p>The new Lidl will divert the majority of its trade from existing food stores in Verwood, including those located in the town centre.</p> <p>There is potential for Lidl to reduce the turnover of the town centre by 22.6%, which we consider to be significantly adverse and this alone justifies refusal.</p> <p>Contrary to Policy KS7 of Core Strategy, and contrary to para 90 of the NPPF</p> <p>Would provide competitive pressure on existing food stores and provide choice.</p>	store is not needed.
Employment			The net gain for the community will not be job creation.
Legal			Proposal risks a legal challenge if planning permission is granted.
Other considerations			Loss of market value to surrounding homes.

6.03 In response to a support campaign carried out by the applicants in May 2020, 427 letters of support were received noting the following comments below. From this total, 332 letters of support were received from 310 addresses. 95 letters of support gave no address.

- General comments of support for proposal.
- Would mean that local residents could walk instead of drive to the supermarket.
- Location would greatly benefit those who cannot drive.
- Good location for store which would benefit local residents in Verwood, as well as West Moors and nearby villages such as Whitmore.

- Existing supermarkets are not sufficient for local population.
- No other suitable sites have been offered up.
- Proposal is less invasive and more suitable than previous nursing home proposal.
- Reference to more harmful traffic impacts outside other food stores in Dorset.
- Would reduce carbon footprint of local residents.
- Support for the charging point as Morrison's charging point does not work
- The proposal demonstrates Lidl's commitment to serve the local community. Would provide an essential amenity in Verwood.
- Would provide competitive pressure on existing food stores and provide choice.
- Additional business of this nature will provide a boost to local employment.
- If it is not possible to locate the store on this site, could it instead be located on Ebblake Industrial Estate?

7.0 CONSULTATIONS

The following responses were received from consultees in relation to the initially submitted and revised design.

7.01 - DC Highways

<p>Initial Design (Sept 2019)</p>	<p>No objection, subject to condition</p> <p>The Highway Authority considers that the submitted Transport Assessment is satisfactory and robust. Whilst it is accepted that the proposal will obviously increase traffic flows on the immediate highway network the residual cumulative impact of the development cannot be thought to be "severe", when consideration is given to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - February 2019.</p>
<p>Revised Design (April 2020)</p>	<p>No objection, subject to condition</p> <p>I can confirm that the information contained within the submitted Transport Addendum is acceptable. The loss of on-site car parking spaces is noted but as the evidence suggests that the reduced number is still sufficient to cover the Saturday peak, the operational needs of the new store are catered for.</p> <p>Hence, the Highway Authority has nothing further to add to its previous observation dated 6 November 2019.</p>
<p>Revised Design</p>	<p>17 June 2020, Defer</p> <p>I note that the car parking layout has been reduced in size from 87 spaces to 79 spaces. Of these spaces, on both layouts, 6 have been</p>

(June 2020)	<p>specifically allocated for staff. The sales area for the store remains effectively the same. Paragraph 3.25 of the Transport Assessment states - "<i>In relation to the proposed development this equates a maximum demand of 75 spaces on a Friday and 82 spaces on a Saturday, equivalent to 86% and 94% of the proposed parking capacity respectively.</i>"</p> <p>So I would have to question whether 73 customer parking spaces are now sufficient to cater for the maximum demand on either a weekday or a Saturday?</p> <p>Appendix E of the Transport Assessment provided a swept path analysis for the largest expected delivery/service vehicle (a 16.5m articulated vehicle) that will service the site. A similar swept path analysis now needs to be submitted demonstrating an articulated delivery vehicle can safely access the site, deliver to the loading bay and leave the site in a forward gear. Also, I request clarification regarding the revised parking situation.</p> <p>19 June 2020, No objection subject to condition</p> <p>Having liaised with the applicant's highway consultant and bearing in mind the submitted Transport Addendum, I can confirm that I have nothing further to add to my previous observation, recommending a conditional approval, dated 24 April 2020.</p>
-------------	--

7.02 - Verwood Town Council

Initial Design (Sept 2019)	<p>Objection</p> <p>Contrary to Policy HE2, relationship to nearby properties including minimise general disturbance to amenity, architectural style, scale unsuitable for location, bulk, landscaping and relationship to mature trees – we strongly object to the removal of the 200 year old oak tree, visual impact detrimental to street scene, concerns regarding heavy traffic. We support the representation made by East Dorset Environment Partnership.</p>
Revised Design (April 2020)	None received.
Revised Design (June 2020)	No objection

7.03 - CED Trees and Landscape

Initial Design (Sept 2019)	Object Removal of the protected oak tree is unacceptable
Revised Design (April 2020)	Object Whilst the tree is retained the construction exclusion zone for the root protection area is insufficient
Revised Design (June 2020)	26 June 2020, Object The construction exclusion zone for the root protection area is still insufficient 14 Sept 2020, no objection subject to condition No objection subject to condition

7.04 - Lead Flood Authority

Initial Design (Sept 2019)	Holding objection We note that the current application is supported by a site-specific Technical Note / Drainage Strategy (TN/DS) compiled by Mayer Brown and dated 12/08/2019, which outlines a preliminary drainage strategy based upon the use of infiltration. However, this preliminary strategy is not substantiated by appropriate investigation or discussion of anticipated ground conditions. On the basis of the information submitted in respect of these proposals, we (DC/FRM) recommend that a (HOLDING) OBJECTION be applied pending the submission & acceptance of further supporting information.
Revised Design (April 2020)	Holding objection Revised information submitted does not include drainage information requested
Revised Design (June 220)	No objection subject to condition The applicant's correspondence of 05/06/2020 fails to offer the necessary assessment of prevailing ground conditions or in-principle agreement from Wessex Water. It does however argue that recent

	<p>restrictions regarding site work have prevented further ground investigation being undertaken and states that existing surface water connections to the adjacent sewer network have been identified. Clearly, we (DC/FRM) are obliged to acknowledge recent difficulties with undertaking ground investigations, with which to inform the (conceptual) drainage strategy but would highlight that such assessment work could / should have been conducted in support of the original submission, prior to any restrictions having been imposed. With regard to the potential contingency arrangement, the applicant would be at liberty to exercise a right to connect to the adjacent surface water sewer, should infiltration not prove viable. However, the rate of discharge and any necessary mitigation works have not been agreed with Wessex Water, as suggested. Therefore, whilst we (DC/FRM) accept that the proposed scheme does have a viable contingency arrangement in the event that soakaways are deemed inappropriate, the applicant should be aware that an equivalent Greenfield runoff rate may be imposed, and that associated improvement works may be required to the receiving system.</p>
--	--

7.05 - East Dorset Environment Partnership

Initial Design	<p>Objection</p> <p>Loss of protected oak tree and use of non-native plants</p>
Revised Design (April 2020)	<p>Objection</p> <p>Root protection area insufficient for the protected oak tree and use of non-native plants is unacceptable.</p> <p>BMEP is not Dorset NET approved.</p> <p>Landscaping scheme needs to be clarified</p>
Revised Design (June 2020)	<p>Root protection area insufficient for the protected oak tree.</p> <p>BMEP is not Dorset NET approved.</p> <p>Concerns regarding tree planting and the lack of a maintenance schedule</p> <p>[Officer note : a Dorset NET approved BMEP was submitted in September 2020]</p>

7.06 – Dorset Council Public Health

Initial	<p>No objection subject to condition</p>
---------	---

Design	Conditions required for noise, light, contaminated land and construction management.
Revised Design (April 2020)	No response
Revised Design (June 2020)	No objection subject to condition Conditions required for to restrict deliveries and plant information required.

7.07 – Dorset Council Conservation

Initial Design	No objection
Revised Design (April 2020)	No objection
Revised Design (June 2020)	N/A – further consultation not required

7.07 – Dorset NET

Initial Design	None received
Revised Design (April 2020)	Amendments required to submitted BMEP (comments sent direct to
Revised Design (June 2020)	No objection BMEP agreed and approved [Officer note : a Dorset NET approved BMEP was submitted in September 2020]

7.08 – Dorset Waste Partnership - None received

7.09 – Dorset Fire & Rescue Service - None received

7.10 – Dorset Police Crime Prevention - None received

8.0 APPRAISAL

8.01 The main planning considerations for this application are:

- The principle development
- Impact on the viability of the Town Centre
- Impact on the character of the area
- Impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring properties
- Impact of the proposal on trees
- Impact of the proposal on flood risk
- Impact on Dorset Heathlands
- Impact on biodiversity
- Impact on highways

8.02 These points and other material considerations are discussed under the headings below.

Principle of development

8.03 The site is situated within the main urban area of Verwood. Policy KS2 of the Christchurch and east Dorset Core Strategy 2014 (CS) states that the location, scale and distribution of development should conform with the settlement hierarchy, which will also help to inform service providers about the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities.

8.04 Policy KS2 of the CS identifies Verwood as a main settlement and notes main settlements are:

The settlements which will provide the major focus for community, cultural, leisure, retail, utility, employment and residential development. This will include infill development as well as options for some greenfield development.

8.05 Policy KS6 of the CS identifies Verwood as a top-tier Town Centre where the supporting text says that enhancements to accessibility and retail provision will be sought over the plan period.

8.06 Development guidance on new retail development in Verwood is set out in Chapter 11 of the CS. Policy VTSW1 sets out the Council's vision for Verwood Town Centre, as a key town centre for East Dorset and is recognised as a busy centre to the local community and visitors. The vision

recognises that uses including employment, retail, leisure, and entertainment, arts, culture and tourism development will be focused within the town centre.

- 8.07 The NPPF 2019, paragraph 80 says that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt, and that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity. Paragraph 81 goes on to say that planning policies should, inter alia, be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. Paragraph 82 says that planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors.
- 8.08 Policy KS8 of the CS recognises that it is important that provision is made for additional retail floorspace to meet the needs of a growing population with associated increasing levels of available spending, and that the existing retail centres maintain and be provided an opportunity to increase their market share of available expenditure within the sub-region. Across East Dorset the projected requirement for additional convenience goods floorspace is 4,000sqm net by 2031, which is to be focussed on Ferndown and West Parley, with, inter alia, Verwood also having potential to deliver smaller scale provision to contribute to the overall district figure.
- 8.09 Paragraph 86 of the NPPF states:
- “Local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses which are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an up-to-date plan. Main town centre uses should be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations; and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered.”*
- 8.10 Policy KS7 of the CS notes that the defined town and district centres are to be the focus for town centre uses, including employment, retail, leisure and entertainment, arts, culture, religion, health, tourism, places of assembly, community facilities and higher density housing. The policy requires a sequential assessment for planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre, to ensure that all in-centre options have been thoroughly assessed before less central sites are considered. An impact assessment is also be required to assess the impact on town centre vitality and viability, town centre investment plans, and the impact on allocated sites outside town centres. Impact assessments are also required for applications for retail developments over 1,000 square metres gross floorspace within Christchurch, Ferndown or Wimborne and over 500 sqm gross elsewhere (which includes Verwood).
- 8.11 In terms of the sequential test the revised NPPF (paragraph 86) states that applications for main town centre uses should be located in town centres first:

“...then in edge of centre locations; and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered”.

Paragraph 87 states that *“when considering edge and out of centre proposals preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre, and applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale, so that opportunities to utilise suitable town centre or edge of centre sites are fully explored”.*

The application site is approximately 650m to the east of the Town Centre boundary (as defined in Map 11.1 ‘Verwood Town Centre Boundary’ of the CS) and is therefore considered to be an ‘out of centre’ site. It is well connected to the Town Centre where it is located on Ringwood Road.

- 8.12 In this instance, the applicant has provided a Planning and Retail Statement (PRS) which sets out a sequential test for the site. It stated that only two potential sites within the town centre could be possible locations, however these have been dismissed by the applicant as they are considered either not suitable to accommodate the proposed development nor available in one instance.
- 8.13 The Council has sought independent advice from Lambert Smith Hampton Consultancy (LSH) regarding the proposed development, specifically the sequential testing and its impact upon the vitality and viability of the town centre of Verwood.
- 8.14 The submitted PRS concluded that as there are no suitable or available town centre sites, or alternative edge of centre sites, therefore the sequential test is passed. LSH, through their own research of available sites within Verwood Town Centre and in light of review of the current evidence, concur with this conclusion. LSH also confirm that they are not aware of other out-of-centre sites that could be considered sequentially preferable to the application site. Officers concur with the findings of LSH.
- 8.15 This being the case, as the site is considered to be an out of centre site, on balance it is the officer’s opinion that the site is acceptable for retail development as the proposed satisfies the sequential test in line with paragraph 86 of the NPPF and Policy KS7 of the CS.

Impact on the viability of Verwood Town Centre

- 8.16 Paragraph 89 of the NPPF 2019 advises:

When assessing applications for retail and leisure development outside town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500m² of gross floorspace). This should include assessment of:

a) the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and

b) the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and the wider retail catchment (as applicable to the scale and nature of the scheme).

- 8.17 As noted previously, the CS has adopted a threshold of 500 square metres, after which a Retail Impact Assessment (RIA) must be provided. Accordingly, a RIA has been supplied, and the impact on the viability of Verwood Town Centre must be considered.
- 8.18 Third party concerns have been raised that there would be a significantly adverse impact on the town centre of Verwood which would justify a refusal of planning permission.
- 8.19 The proposed development would significantly increase the retail offer in Verwood. Lidl's business model is to provide limited food lines with some ad-hoc sales of other goods. The stores do not sell tobacco, stationary goods or pharmacy goods and there are no food counters (for example fishmongers or butchers). As a result, the store would compete with a limited number of other stores in the area.
- 8.20 As noted above, the Council has sought independent advice from Lambert Smith Hampton Consultancy (LSH) regarding the proposed development, specifically its impact upon the vitality and viability of the town centre of Verwood.
- 8.21 The LHS appraisal focused on the applicant's assessment of the proposed scheme compliancy with the NPPF's sequential and impact tests. LSH have also had consideration of the planning representation made by Peacock & Smith (P&S) in respect of their client Morrisons, who operate an out-of-centre supermarket in Verwood.
- 8.22 In terms of the sequential test – As noted above, the submitted RPS concluded that as there are no suitable or available town centre sites, or alternative edge of centre sites, the sequential test is passed. LSH and Council Officers concur with this.

- 8.23 In terms of the retail impact assessment - The analysis of Verwood town centre vitality and viability both within the Bournemouth, Christchurch and East Dorset Joint Retail and Leisure Study (BCEDJRLS) and the Planning and Retail Statement Addendum (PRSA) show that Verwood is a vital and viable town centre with no long term vacancies, any vacancies are quickly reoccupied showing strong demand for space and enterprise. LSH contend that the impact on the overall vitality and viability will be minimal, particularly due to the limited convenience goods composition of the town centre. In this case (as identified in the full LHS appraisal), the majority of trade diversion will fall on out-of-centre stores, which are more comparable to the proposal and which will therefore experience the highest level of trade impact. Furthermore and as set out in paragraph 4.4.4 of the PRSA, only 5% of the town centre comprises of convenience goods retailing. The majority (51%) of the town centre uses comprise service facilities and the remaining 44% comprise comparison goods retailing. Therefore a significant part of the town centre is unlikely to be affected by the proposed development at all, on the like for like basis.
- 8.24 LHS noted the representation on behalf of Morrisons has raised questions on the robustness of the submitted PRSA trade diversion assumptions. LSH have reviewed the assumptions by the applicant and the objector and believe that the approach in the submitted PRSA is more credible and reflects the existing trade draw of existing stores in the Study Area. The applicant's approach seeks to claw back trade from existing over-trading Lidl stores in Ringwood and Ferndown and the assumptions are realistic against existing over trading and movement of expenditure between different study zones. The results show that the impact on the convenience goods turnover of Verwood Town Centre, would not be significant adverse and the overall impact on the town centre will be nominal given the limited role and offer of the convenience goods retailing. The main impact would fall on out-of-centre facilities that are not protected by retail planning policy. Again, LHS conclude the impact will not represent an adverse impact on the town centre's overall vitality and viability, as defined in paragraph 89b of the NPPF and Policy KS7 of the local plan and therefore the proposal is considered acceptable.
- 8.25 Officers consider that it is appropriate to condition any approval to ensure that should the company's business model alter in the future, it would not be in a position to sell goods that would have a harmful impact on the viability of other stores within the town centre (condition 3).
- 8.26 Whilst third party concerns regarding the robustness of trade diversion assumptions are noted these have been considered on balance and taking into account the above factors, it is the officer's opinion that the proposal will not have a harmful impact on the vitality and viability of Verwood Town Centre and accords with policy KS7 of the CS.

Scale, design, impact on character and appearance

- 8.27 The character of the area to Ringwood Road is mixed with both residential development and commercial, including a petrol station and car dealership opposite. The area comprises both single and two storey structures and a three storey mixed-use development located at the junction of Ringwood Road and Black Hill to the south east of the application site.
- 8.28 The character of the area to the other surrounding roads of Crescent Road, Heathlands Road and Shard Close is residential. Dwellings are mainly single storey with the exception of some two storey dwellings on Crescent Road.
- 8.29 A number of third party concerns have been received throughout the application process where it is considered the proposed would impact negatively on the character of the area. Concerns were also initially raised by the planning officer and a revised design was submitted in May 2020 as a result of this. Changes included:
- Main building repositioned to avoid impact on the protected oak tree
 - Protected oak tree retained
 - Car parking area reduced (as a result of repositioning)
 - Materials changed to include brick and timber cladding and render removed
 - Separation distances to neighbouring boundaries improved to the south and west
 - Overall height reduced by approx. 1m with a change to floor levels where the finished floor level (FFL) has been is now 1m below ground floor level (GFL).
- 8.30 The proposed store utilises a standardised design for discount retailers. Externally, the building would have a flat and mono-pitched roof rising to a maximum height of around 5.8m above ground floor level (GFL) towards the eastern side of the building. The lower, length of flat roof would run from the northern to the southern end of the building on its eastern side, adjacent to the boundary with 19 Crescent Road. The proposed cladding materials would comprise glazing (including full height curtain wall glazing), red brick, timber cladding and silver metal cladding. An external plant area would be located alongside the building's eastern elevation (adjacent to 19 Crescent Road), whilst a covered trolley area would be located at the northern end of the eastern elevation (also adjacent to 19 Crescent Road). A loading bay and associated access ramp would be located at the northern end of the building's western elevation (adjacent to 3 Heathlands Close). The parking area would include 79 parking spaces and 12 cycle parking stands are also proposed.
- 8.31 The design is considered to be relatively functional. Glazing is primarily limited to the front (north east) elevation of the store, which faces the proposed car park. There is a degree of glazing on the south east elevation, which identifies the entrance to the building. There are 2 modest high-level windows to the north west. The proposed design is considered to be generally acceptable.

- 8.32 While the footprint would be noticeably larger than the adjacent residential dwellings the main view of the proposed will be from Ringwood Road and the proposed is set back some 45m from the road frontage. Notwithstanding this, the existing garage opposite has a foot print of approximately 25x45m, which is more in keeping with the proposed.
- 8.33 Further to this the proposed is single storey only and finished floor levels have been reduced by 1m so the building sits lower in the site, which results in a building height that is more in keeping with the adjacent dwellings at 4-5.8m above GFL and adjacent dwellings are 5-5.5m in height. Whilst the scale of the building is larger than the surrounding area, the height is of a domestic scale comparable to existing residential development fronting Ringwood Road. It is considered necessary to condition finished floor levels to ensure the appropriate height is secured (condition 24).
- 8.34 It is acknowledged the proposed will also be visible from Crescent Road but will be somewhat screened by protected trees, existing substantial hedging to be retained (approx. 2.5m high) and proposed boundary fencing. The main building will be 9m from the public highway and will be 4-5.8m high. Plant proposed to the south east corner will be enclosed by 2.5m high acoustic fencing, which will not be very visible with 2.1m acoustic fencing surrounding the application site.
- 8.35 In terms of materials for the store, in addition to the glazing, the applicant is proposing that the walls are mostly brick with timber and metal cladding at higher levels. Given the mixed character of the area and use of mixed materials such as brick, render and metal cladding, the proposed materials are considered to be generally acceptable subject a condition for samples of the materials to be agreed (condition 30).
- 8.36 The proposed is currently in use as caravan storage site with an open frontage. Therefore the current outlook from Ringwood Road is of parked caravans. The car park will cover the majority of the site to the north providing 79 vehicle spaces and 12 cycle parking spaces. The majority of the existing site is also hard surfaced. Existing protected trees and hedging will be retained. As such, the character of the area is not considered to be harmfully impacted and landscape additions to the car park area is likely to be an improvement to the current application site.
- 8.37 Taking the above matters into account, it is the officer's opinion that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area and accord with policies HE2 of the CS.

Impact on Trees and Proposed Landscaping

- 8.38 Initial designs proposed to remove an existing protected oak tree to the south east, which raised a number of third party concerns and an objection from the Dorset Council Tree Officer (DCTO).
- 8.39 Initial revisions to the scheme were rejected by officers due to impact on the root protection area (RPA) of the tree and therefore the its long term health
- 8.40 At a subsequent site meeting between officers, the applicant, their Arboriculturist the following revisions were agreed in principle:
- The corner closest to tree in question to be reduced by removing the corner at a 45 degree angle.
 - Further tree planting to be provided in the car park area to be agreed by the DCTO.
- 8.41 Revised tree and landscape information was submitted in August 2020. As changes relate to specific agreed tree and landscaping issues internal to the site, only the Tree Officer was consulted on these amendments.
- 8.42 Landscape proposals include the retention of 7 of the 14 existing trees including the protected oak tree; an additional 9 trees added; retention of existing hedging to the boundaries; additional native hedging added to boundaries; some soft landscaping to the edges in the form of shrub planting, wildflower, wood mulch (around the protected oak tree). Additional trees to be planted will include 3 semi-mature trees in the proximity of the disabled parking spaces to the front of the proposed building. In addition to boundary hedging a 2.1m high acoustic fence with surround the perimeter (except the frontage to Ringwood Road). Proposed landscaping and boundary treatments are generally considered acceptable.
- 8.43 The DCTO has raised no objection to the revised design subject to conditions in relation to tree protection and details of the 3 trees in the car parking area (conditions 27-29).
- 8.44 It is also noted third party concerns were raised regarding non-native plant species proposed. The DCTO has considered the proposed species and confirms they are acceptable.
- 8.45 Taking the above matters into account, it is the officer's opinion that the proposal is acceptable in terms of tree and landscaping matters and accords with policies HE2 of the CS.

Impact on amenity

- 8.46 As previously mentioned, the area is largely residential and third party concerns have been raised that the proposed would impact negatively on

neighbouring amenity in terms of noise disturbance from intensified use, plant, traffic movements and hours of operation; loss of light; loss of privacy; air pollution and light pollution.

- 8.47 The current use of the majority of the application site is for caravan storage, which has been in place since 1971. It is acknowledged the change of use of the site will lead to an intensification of the use of the land compared to the current use.
- 8.48 Proximity of the proposed buildings to neighbouring boundaries are as follows:

Orientation and Address	Proposed Proximity
West 3 Heathland Close	Delivery area – 6m Staff parking – 4.5m
West 21a Newton Road	Main building – 3 – 7m
North and west 72 Ringwood Road	Staff parking – 2m Customer parking – 1.5m
East 1 Shard Close	Customer parking – 2.7m
South and east 21 Crescent Road	Customer parking – 1.5m
South and east 19 Crescent Road	Plant area – 1.5m Main building – 6m
South 9 Crescent Road	Main building – 9-23m

Noise and disturbance

- 8.49 In terms of noise disturbance – A Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) has been submitted in support of the application and the DC Environmental Health Officer (DCEHO) has been consulted. Areas of concern are to the north west where the delivery area is located and to the south east where the plant room

is located, which are in close proximity to neighbouring boundaries as identified in the table above.

- 8.50 The DCEHO has noted the applicant has demonstrated through assessment and modelling that noise associated with the development, including deliveries, will have a low impact on the nearest sensitive receptors during the day and fall below the Low Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) with mitigation measures proposed such as acoustic fencing. They have shown that such deliveries at night will have an adverse effect. DCEHO has raised no objection to the proposed subject to noise conditions (conditions 6-8) and that hours of deliveries are restricted as proposed by the applicant and has been conditioned as such (07:00-22:00, condition 5).
- 8.51 The applicant has proposed opening hours of 07:00 – 22:00 Monday – Saturday and 10:00 – 17:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays (subject to Sunday trading laws). A Delivery management Plan was also submitted and the applicant has proposed to restrict delivery hours where there will be no deliveries between 22:00 and 07:00. The officer notes standard hours of operation imposed on retail units in the Dorset Council are 08:00 – 22:00 Monday – Saturday and 10:00 – 17:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays (subject to Sunday trading laws). The DCEHO is satisfied with these proposed hours of operation including deliveries. Given the proximity to neighbouring dwellings, in particular the delivery area to the west and parking areas to the east and west, it is considered necessary to impose standard hours of operation and not to extend these. Conditions will be imposed as such (condition 4).
- 8.52 It is noted the delivery area is within close proximity of the neighbouring property to the west. However, again the noise assessment has demonstrated deliveries will have a LOAEL on neighbouring properties with the use of acoustic fencing on the western boundary with additional 2.1m high fencing proposed around the delivery area. Again, hours of deliveries have been restricted as proposed by the applicant and agreed by the DCEHO (07:00-22:00, condition 5).
- 8.53 Some of the car parking spaces are situated in close proximity to the residential properties, notably those to the east and west. A 2.1m close boarded acoustic fence is proposed around the entire site except the frontage to Ringwood Road and existing hedging is retained to the west, south and south east. This will serve to reduce the impact of the car park on neighbouring properties. Hours of use have also been conditioned as noted above (condition 4).

Loss of light

- 8.54 In terms of loss of light – A Daylight Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. This provided an overshadowing assessment for the initial design which was higher. It concluded that the overshadowing analysis for the surrounding gardens to the north and west 72 Ringwood Road, 3 Heathland Close, 21a Newtown Road; to the southwest the gardens at 7&9 Crescent Road; and to the southeast the gardens at Pottery Lodge, 19, 21 and 24 Crescent Road; has shown that more than half of the individual gardens will continue to be adequately sunlit on the 21st March, thus satisfying the BRE guidelines.
- 8.55 Notwithstanding this the proposed finished floor level will be 1m below ground level, which is lower than assessed in the overshadowing analysis and brings the proposed height in line with neighbouring properties. As highlighted in the table above, the proposed main building is situated 3-23m from neighbouring boundaries and the plant area within 1.5m. The highest point of the roof is situated to the east, which is approx. 5.8m high above GFL. At the highest point it will be 11.5m from the neighbouring boundary. Officers are therefore satisfied that the scale of the building would not have an overbearing effect on the nearest residential properties nor will there be a loss of light as a result of the proposed.

Loss of privacy

- 8.56 In terms of privacy to adjacent properties – only 2 very modest high level windows are proposed to western elevation to serve staff areas and while they directly face the boundary of 3 Heathlands Close, they are 18m away and are screened by 2.1m acoustic fencing. Only a ground floor level is proposed and as such there are no concerns with regards to the impact of the proposals on the privacy of the neighbouring residents. The proposed 2.1m acoustic fence to surround the site and retained hedging will also provide sufficient screening for all boundaries.

Light pollution

- 8.57 In terms of light pollution - the proposed development will require relatively significant levels of external lighting and a Lighting Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. The DCEHO has been consulted and has raised no objection to the proposed lighting but does note:

The light spill from the site must be in accordance with the light spill charts within the Light Assessment Report by Signify dated 04/07/19 and not cause an adverse impact to any neighbouring residential property. As detailed in the design and access statement I would recommend a condition to ensure the car park lighting is switched off overnight and when there are no customers in the store lights are powered down.

However it is noted, members of staff will only leave the store when customers have left once the store is closed. Officers therefore consider that it is reasonable to condition that the external lighting will be switched off an hour after the store has closed (conditions 9 and 10).

Air pollution

- 8.58 In terms of air pollution – while there may be some impact in relation to air pollution as a result of increased traffic movements it is noted Ringwood Road is already a busy road with significant amounts of traffic. Car parking is located to the north of the site with access off Ringwood Road, which contains the site traffic movements within the proximity of Ringwood Road. It is therefore not anticipated that air pollution would increase as a result of the proposed to an extent that would warrant refusal.
- 8.59 The DCEHO also requested a condition to require a construction management plan to be written and agreed before development commences. The plan should include details of how nearby residents will not be caused disturbance or nuisance during construction and a suitable condition will be imposed (condition 14).
- 8.60 Taking the above factors into account, while the case officer initially had concerns regarding impact on neighbouring amenity, it is now considered these concerns have now been overcome in planning terms with design amendments and mitigation measures. While there will be some impact on neighbouring amenity as a result of the change and intensification of use, it is the officer's opinion that the proposal would not result in an unduly harmful impact on the amenity of the neighbouring residents that would warrant refusal. The proposed is therefore considered to accord with policy HE2 of the CS.

Impact on Heritage Assets

- 8.61 There are some listed buildings in the wider area of the application site located on Black Hill Road and Newtown Road. Third party concerns have been raised that the proposed would impact negatively on these and the ancient monument of Stephen's Castle, located some 850m from the application site.
- 8.62 Paragraph 193 of the NPPF requires when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

- 8.63 The closest listed buildings are some 40-50m from the application site. Given the single storey nature of the proposed it is not anticipated that it would be noticeably visible within the context of these listed buildings and therefore no harm is anticipated. Given the distance of 850m to Stephens Castle, the proposed is not considered to cause harm to the ancient monument.
- 8.64 The Dorset Council Conservation Officer (DCCO) has been consulted and raised no conservation concerns or objection to the proposed.
- 8.65 It is the officer's opinion that the proposed will not affect the setting of the listed buildings given the distance to these buildings and so will not impact negatively on heritage assets in the surrounding area and it is considered to be in accordance with policies HE1 of the CS.

Highway Safety and Parking

- 8.66 The proposed store would provide a car park to the north of the site to accommodate 79 vehicle parking spaces (including 6 for disabled users and 6 parent/toddler spaces) and 12 cycle parking stands. A delivery area with associated ramp to the store is located to the west of the site (adjacent to the boundary with 3 Heathlands Close). Access is proposed from Ringwood Road through the existing site entrance, which would be modified to make it suitable to serve the proposal. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been submitted in the support of the proposed application.
- 8.67 Third party concerns have been raised that the proposed would create highways safety issues, it was too close to the First School and that the parking and access is insufficient.
- 8.68 Dorset Council parking guidelines suggest the following parking provision for a retail development of this size (greater than 500m²):
- 1 vehicle parking space per 14m²
 - 1 vehicle parking space per 2 full-time staff
 - 1 cycle parking space per 350m²
- 8.69 The submitted TA notes the gross internal area (GIA) of 1,698sqm and retail floor area (RFA) of 1,172sqm is proposed. It also notes employee numbers will remain consistent with approximately 40 employees in a combination of both part and full-time positions, with the number of store staff onsite ranging from 3 to 10 at any one-time depending on the day/time of the week.
- 8.70 Based on Dorset Council parking guidance the following parking provision is required:

Staff parking – 1 per 2 full time staff = 5
 Customer parking – 1 per 14m² = 84
 Total required = 89
 Total provided = 79

Cycle parking – 1 per 350m² = 3
 Total provided = 12

- 8.71 It is noted that there is an under provision of parking of 10 spaces as required by Dorset Council guidance, however it is noted this is guidance only. The TA provides a detailed assessment on parking provision with a with a summary of the resulting predicted maximum parking demand on both a weekday and Saturday for the various assessments undertaken, outlined as follows:

Day	Expected Maximum Parking Demand	
	Hourly Assessment	30-minute dwell time
Weekday	38 spaces @ 12:00 – 13:00	49 spaces @ 14:15 – 15:00
Saturday	50 spaces @ 11:00 – 12:00	71 spaces @ 11:15 – 12:00

- 8.72 DC Highways has been consulted on the proposal. In response to the initial design it was considered that the submitted TA is satisfactory and robust. The DC Highways Officer (DCHO) noted whilst it is accepted that the proposal will obviously increase traffic flows on the immediate highway network the residual cumulative impact of the development cannot be thought to be "severe", when consideration is given to paragraph 109 of the NPPF 2019.

- 8.73 It is noted that DC Highways did raise concerns initially regarding parking provision in the subsequent revised design and amended TA and sought further clarification. The DC Highways Officer noted:

Having liaised with the applicant's highway consultant and bearing in mind the submitted Transport Addendum, I can confirm that I have nothing further to add to my previous observation, recommending a conditional approval, dated 24 April 2020.

- 8.74 Concerns raised in relation to the proximity of the First School are noted. However, the application site is approximately a 1 mile walk from the site to the north west and again no highways safety concerns have been raised.
- 8.75 With the above in mind it is the officer's opinion that, on balance, the proposed parking provision is considered sufficient. With no highway safety considerations the proposed is considered to be in accordance with polices KS11 and KS12 of the core strategy.

Flooding and Drainage

- 8.76 The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding) in accordance with the Environment Agency's (EA) indicative modelling, but is thought to be at some theoretical risk of surface water flooding & ponding, principally adjacent to Ringwood Road and proposed site entrance, during severe rainfall events (1:100/1000yr).
- 8.77 Third party concerns have been raised that the proposed would cause a flood risk and would impact negatively on neighbouring properties as a result.
- 8.78 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LFA) has been consulted on the proposals. They initially requested a holding objection to the proposal due to the lack of site investigation information provided.
- 8.79 After further direct correspondence with the applicant, the LFA noted the applicant provided information that argues that recent restrictions regarding site work have prevented further ground investigation being undertaken and states that existing surface water connections to the adjacent sewer network have been identified.
- 8.80 The LFA are obliged to acknowledge recent difficulties with undertaking ground investigations, with which to inform the (conceptual) drainage strategy but would highlight that such assessment work could / should have been conducted in support of the original submission, prior to any restrictions having been imposed.
- 8.81 With regard to the potential contingency arrangement, the applicant would be at liberty to exercise a right to connect to the adjacent surface water sewer, should infiltration not prove viable. However, the rate of discharge and any necessary mitigation works have not been agreed with Wessex Water, as suggested. Therefore, the LFA accept that the proposed scheme does have a viable contingency arrangement in the event that soakaways are deemed inappropriate, the applicant should be aware that an equivalent Greenfield runoff rate may be imposed, and that associated improvement works may be required to the receiving system.
- 8.82 The LFA removed their holding objection and confirmed they have no objection subject to drainage and surface water conditions (conditions 22 and 23).
- 8.83 Therefore it is the officer's opinion that the proposed is considered to be in accordance with polices ME6 of the CS.

Contaminated land

- 8.84 The site has been identified as medium risk contaminated land as the site was historically used as a road haulage yard and adjacent land as brickworks.

- 8.85 Dorset Council Environmental Health has been consulted and has raised no objection to the proposed in relation to contaminated land subject to a condition requiring a desktop assessment to be undertaken to establish the potential risk of contamination (conditions 11-13).
- 8.86 Therefore it is the officer's opinion that the proposed is considered to be in accordance with Dorset Council protocol in relation to contaminated land.

Biodiversity

- 8.87 Given the size of the site a biodiversity survey has been undertaken and a Biodiversity Mitigation Enhancement Plan (BMEP) submitted in support of the application. A revised BMEP which includes the most up to date plan was submitted in September 2020 and includes bird boxes, bat boxes, shrub and tree planting, woodland wildflower mix to be planted.
- 8.88 A BMEP was submitted to Dorset NET and NET requested amendments. A revised BMEP was submitted to NET in September 2020 and was approved on 15.09.2020. A condition will be applied requiring the implementation of the enhancement scheme (condition 25).
- 8.89 The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of biodiversity interests and accords with policies ME4 of the CS.

Proximity to SSSI heathland

- 8.90 The site is situated approximately 400m from the Verwood Heath SSSI. The Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 main concern is the increase in residential development up to 5km within the proximity of protected sites and paragraph 3.1 notes:

Natural England has advised the authorities of concerns arising from the increase in residential development across South East Dorset and the resultant pressures placed upon protected heathland by new occupants of these developments living in close proximity to the heathlands.

- 8.91 Appendix B of the SPD also offers advice for different uses and possible impacts, all of which have a residential related use type such as C1, C2, C3, C4, houses of multiple occupancy, touring/caravan sites, gypsy/traveller sites and student accommodation.
- 8.92 Whilst the proposed is within 400m of Verwood Heath SSSI it is for non-residential use only, class A1 (shops) and has been conditioned as such (condition 3). Therefore there was no trigger for consultation with Natural England.

- 8.93 The proposed is not considered to have an impact on the nearby SSSI heathland. Therefore it is the officer's opinion that the proposed is considered to be in accordance with policies ME2 of the CS.

Economic Benefit

- 8.94 The proposed development would provide a clear economic benefit to Verwood and surrounding areas. The development would employ approximately 40 employees in a combination of both part and full-time positions time equivalent jobs in the store. This is considered to be a positive benefit to the area.
- 8.95 The application is CIL liable and monies will be secured via the Dorset Council CIL process for the Eastern area. An informative has been added to notify the applicant of this (informative 4).

Waste

- 8.96 The applicant has confirmed by email that all waste is managed, sorted and stored within the onsite warehouse. It is then collected by a private third party haulier and taken to the regional distribution centre where it is responsibly processed.
- 8.97 It is noted no comments were received from the Dorset Waste Partnership (DWP), however, as waste is managed privately, comments from DWP are not required.

9.0 HUMAN RIGHTS

- 9.01 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

- 9.02 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.

10.0 PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITIES DUTY

- 10.1 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.

10.2 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.

11.0 CLIMATE IMPLICATIONS

11.1 The proposal would increase the number of vehicle trips to the application site. However, more sustainable transport options are also available as the application site is located within close proximity to the town centre boundary where there are existing public transport links and 14 cycle parking stands will be provided.

11.2 Existing protected trees are retained on site. In addition to this, while 7 trees will be lost, 9 will be planted resulting in 2 additional trees being added to the site.

11.3 The main climate impacts will be result of increased vehicle trips. This is generally expected with new development and given the options of alternative more sustainable transport options the proposed is considered acceptable.

12. CONCLUSION

12.01 Taking all of the above matters into account, on balance officers consider that all material planning considerations have been addressed and the proposal can be supported.

12.02 The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation: Approve, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions/Reasons:

[All pre-commencement conditions have been agreed by the agent by email on 16.09.2020 2020]

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.

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

- Proposed site layout ref. AD310 rev B
- Proposed building plan ref. AD311 rev A
- Proposed roof plan ref. AD312 rev A
- Proposed elevations ref. AD313 rev A
- Proposed boundary treatments ref. AD314 rev B
- Proposed site finishes ref. AD315 rev B
- Proposed site plan with topo overlay ref. AD318 rev B
- Proposed soft landscaping ref. 9001 rev P10
- Proposed levels ref SD 700
- Proposed sections SD 701
- Proposed sections SD 702
- Proposed lighting layout ref. D-371170 rev 4

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

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 and the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, the development hereby approved shall be used as a discount food retailer only and for no other use whatsoever (including under classes A1 and Class E of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)) and in accordance with the following:

- 1) the sales area (convenience and comparison goods) shall not exceed 1172sqm;
- 2) The food store shall not provide any of the following services without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority;
 - a) Fresh meat counter
 - b) Fresh fish counter
 - c) Delicatessen/cheese counter
 - d) Hot Food (except bakery items baked on site)
 - e) Post office services but not including the sale of books or postage stamps

Reason: The application is justified on the basis of the provision of a discount food retailer on the site and the Local Planning Authority require control is retained over the use of the development for this purpose in the interests of the

vitality and viability of the existing town centre and for the protection of neighbouring amenity given the location of the application site and proximity to neighbouring boundaries.

4. The store must only open to customers between 08:00 and 22:00 on Mondays to Saturdays (including bank holidays) and between 10:00 and 17:00 on Sundays. No new customers must be admitted to the premises before or after these times.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of adjoining and nearby residential properties.

5. Deliveries must not commence before 07:00 and must terminate by 22:00.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of adjoining and nearby residential properties, taking account of the cumulative noise generated by deliveries and plant machinery associated with the store.

6. The noise levels from the site including plant shall not exceed the predicted noise levels modelled in the submitted report "Noise Impact Assessment by Acoustic Consultant Ltd. Proposed Lidl Food Store, Verwood, Reference: 7649/JA/BL. Dated 21 August 2020". Plant shall be installed as per the assessment and the mitigation measures listed must be implemented and maintained unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect neighbouring amenity.

7. The Delivery Management Plan must be fully implemented for the lifetime of the development. The boundary treatments and acoustic fencing around the loading bay and plant compound must be implemented and maintained as detailed in Appendix 1 drawing no. AD124 for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In order to protect neighbouring amenity

8. The noise levels from deliveries shall not exceed the predicted noise levels modelled in the submitted report "Noise Impact Assessment" by Acoustic Consultant Ltd. Proposed Lidl Food Store, Verwood, Reference: 7649/BL. Dated 23rd July 2020". The mitigation measures set out in the Noise impact Assessment must be implemented and maintained for the lifetime of the development unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect neighbouring amenity.

9. The lighting scheme shall be implemented to accord with the light spill charts within the Light Assessment Report by Signify dated 21/09/20 and the agreed lighting must be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the lighting does not increase the effects of light pollution in the area, and to protect the amenity of the residents of the neighbouring properties.

10. All external lighting shall be switched off an hour after the store closes and shall be switched on no earlier than half an hour before the store opens.

Reason: To reduce the impact of light pollution on the area and to protect the amenity of the neighbouring residents.

11. No development approved by this planning permission shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site in respect of the development hereby permitted, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. This strategy will include the following components:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - all previous uses
 - potential contaminants associated with those uses
 - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
 - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site
2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those offsite.
3. The results of the site investigation in (1) and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

The development must be carried out in accordance with the approved remediation strategy and remediation measures.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. This is in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. On completion of all the works detailed in the agreed Remediation Strategy, a Remediation Verification Report must then be completed by the environmental consultant(s) who carried out the remediation work confirming that they have supervised all the agreed remediation actions. This report must be submitted to the planning authority confirming that all works as specified and agreed have been carried out to the point of completion. The development must not be brought into use until the Planning Authority is in receipt of said Remediation Verification Report and has confirmed in writing that it is satisfied with the contents of the statement and the standard of work completed

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. This is in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

14. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
- measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
- details of how disturbance or nuisance during construction will be managed to reduce impact on neighbouring residents.

The development must be carried out in accordance with the approved remediation strategy and remediation measures.

Reason: This information is required prior to commencement to safeguard the amenity of the locality.

15. Before the development hereby approved commences a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CTMP must include:

- construction vehicle details (number, size, type and frequency of movement)
- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries
- timings of deliveries so as to avoid, where possible, peak traffic periods
- a framework for managing abnormal loads
- contractors' arrangements (compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage)
- wheel cleaning facilities

- vehicle cleaning facilities
- a scheme of appropriate signing of vehicle route to the site
- a route plan for all contractors and suppliers to be advised on
- temporary traffic management measures where necessary

The development must be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: to minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network and prevent the possible deposit of loose material on the adjoining highway.

16. Before the development is occupied or utilised the first 15.00 metres of the vehicle access, measured from the rear edge of the highway (excluding the vehicle crossing – see the Informative Note below), must be laid out and constructed to a specification submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

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

17. Before the development is occupied or utilised the redundant highway vehicular crossings must be expunged and reinstated to a specification which must first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

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

18. Before the development is occupied or utilised the areas shown on Drawing Number AD310_REV B for the access, manoeuvring, parking, loading and unloading of vehicles have been surfaced, marked out and made available for these purposes. Thereafter, these areas must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site and to ensure that highway safety is not adversely impacted upon.

19. The development hereby permitted must not be occupied or utilised until a scheme showing precise details of the proposed cycle parking facilities has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme must be constructed before the development is commenced and, thereafter, must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.

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

20. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised the visibility splay areas as shown on Drawing Number B/LIDLVERWOOD.1/02 Rev D must

be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.60 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. The splay areas must thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstructions.

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

21. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised, the submitted Travel Plan must be implemented and operational.

Reason: In order to reduce or mitigate the impacts of the development upon the local highway network and surrounding neighbourhood by reducing reliance on the private car for journeys to and from the site.

22. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and providing clarification of how drainage is to be managed during construction, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is completed.

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

23. No development shall take place until details of maintenance and management of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These must include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

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

24. The finished floor level of the development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the Proposed Levels drawing SD 700 dated May 2020 unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the character of the area and neighbouring amenity.

25. The development hereby approved shall not be first brought into use unless and until the mitigation measures as detailed in the approved biodiversity mitigation plan (Hannah Knight AICEEM dated 08.09.20 and approved by NET 15.09.2020) have been completed in full, unless any modifications to the agreed mitigation plan as a result of the requirements of a European Protected Species Licence, or the results of subsequent bat surveys have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter approved mitigations measures shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of nature conservation.

26. Landscape management works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details as shown on the submitted document ref: 'AAJ-5172-RPS-XX-EX-DR-L-9002_P01' and 'AD315 rev B'. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is completed and must be implemented and maintained for the lifetime of the development unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of nature conservation and to ensure the scheme is maintained in accordance with the approved plans and to accord with Policies HE2 and HE3 of the Local Plan and Government Guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

27. Before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site for the purposes of development, a pre-commencement site meeting between the Tree Officer, Arboricultural Consultant and Site Manager shall take place to confirm the protection of trees on and adjacent to the site in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement prepared ref: JSL 3269 – 770D dated August 2020. The tree protection shall be positioned as shown on the Tree Protection Plan, ref: RPS 701F dated July 2020 before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development. The tree protection shall be retained until the development is completed and nothing shall be placed within the fencing, nor shall any ground levels be altered or excavations made without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall not be discharged until an arboricultural supervision statement, the contents of which are to be discussed and agreed at the pre-commencement meeting, is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority on completion of development.

In order for this condition to be discharged the local planning authority shall be notified for a site inspection at each of the following stages: completion of the specified tree protection; any alteration to the scheme of tree protection; before commencing excavations for drains and soakaways; removal of tree protection; and prior to the commencement of the landscaping phase.

Reason: This meeting is required prior to commencement of development in the interests of tree protection and to accord with Policies HE2 and HE3 of the Core Strategy.

28. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details as shown on submitted drawing ref: AAJ-5172-RPS-XX-EX-DR-L-9001_P10 and . The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development and the planting carried out in the first planting

season following completion of the development. Any planting found damaged, dead or dying in the first five years following their planting are to be duly replaced with appropriate species.

Reason: This information is required prior to occupation of development in order to ensure the implementation of the scheme is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and to accord with Policies HE2 and HE3 of the Local Plan and Government Guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

29. Notwithstanding details already submitted with the application, the planting of x3 extra heavy standard trees as shown on submitted drawing ref: AAJ-5172-RPS-XX-EX-DR-L-9901_P10 shall be detailed. Such detail shall include the structural tree pit system to be used, specification of infill soil to be used and volume as well as means of permanent irrigation. Such detail shall be submitted to the LPA and approved in writing prior to the commencement of works.

Reason: This meeting is required prior to commencement of development in the interests of tree protection and to accord with Policies HE2 and HE3 of the Core Strategy.

30. No development above DPC (damp proof course) shall take place until details and samples of all external facing and roofing materials have been provided on site, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). All works shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA.

Reason: This information is required prior to above ground work commencing to ensure satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing.

Informatives:

1. Dorset Council Highways - 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 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 221000), by email at dorsetdirect@dorsetcc.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. Sunday Trading Hours - Notwithstanding the opening hours agreed in condition 4 of the approval, the applicant is reminded that the store must comply with any applicable laws in relation to Sunday trading hours.
3. Noise - The applicant is advised if substantiated noise complaints from nearby residents in the future are received the Council has a duty to investigate and take action to abate any statutory nuisance identified within the remit of part III of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

4. The applicant needs to be aware that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be applied to this development. The Council will shortly be issuing a CIL Liability Notice following the grant of this permission which will provide information on the applicant's obligations.