

Northern Area Planning Committee
Written Submissions
11 January 2021

Item 4a – P/FUL/2020/00052 – Grove Farm, Chaffey Moor Hill, Bourton

Peter Diggins – Against the application

As an immediate neighbour of Grove Farm, I OBJECT strongly to this application, which is for a large commercial development in the garden of Grove Farm, currently a residential property in a quiet rural lane. The lane has no pavements and is a popular route for dog walkers, families with pushchairs and horse-riders as it forms the western end of a circular loop around the village.

In paragraph 13 of this report, Planning Principles are set out. I quote from these below with my additional comments *in italics*

13.2 “...promote leisure developments... where identified needs are not met by existing rural service centres”.

No needs have been identified in this application. Pilates, Yoga, Thai Chi etc are all already provided in Bourton Village Hall and elsewhere within Bourton village.

13.3 “Policy 20 ...that development outside defined settlement boundaries will **only** be permitted if it is of a type appropriate in the countryside or it can be demonstrated there is an ‘overriding need’ for it to be located in the countryside.”

There is absolutely no “overriding need” for a wellness resort to be built in this rural location.

13.4 “However, there is no overriding need for it to be located in the countryside.”

These are the words of the planning officer!

13.5 “...Policy 11 of the Local Plan states that economic development will be supported in the countryside by enabling rural communities to plan to meet their own local needs, particularly through neighbourhood planning.”

As is evident from Bourton Parish Council’s statement, this development contravenes a number of Bourton Neighbourhood Plan policies. Furthermore, Bourton PC members have studied this application and are unanimously opposed to it, especially as there is absolutely no ‘need’ for it.

13.7 “Policy 12will be supported provided they would contribute to the character and vitality of the local area, protect residential amenity, do not adversely impact upon road safety and conform to the environmental and other policies in this plan.”

This application directly contravenes all of the principles of policy 12 of Bourton’s Adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

13.8 "...while no specific local need is identified there is no reason to assume clients would not come from the local area...."

If this were true, why is there a need for a 20 person B&B?

13.10 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle.

I would strongly suggest that the proposal is contrary to all of the principles against which it is being tested.

Bourton Parish Council and every neighbour in Chaffey Moor Hill objects to this application. I would urge the committee to reject it as a commercial development of this scale is unwarranted and entirely unsuited to this quiet rural lane.

Helen Bedford – Against the Application

I am a neighbour in Chaffey Moor Hill. I look directly onto Grove Farm and I strongly OBJECT to this application which is for a commercial wellness resort unsuited to this rural lane.

In section 3.0 of your report, you set out the following reasons for recommendation with my comments *in italics*

- 1) - Will result in the creation of a business to the benefit of the local rural economy and which is supported by the NPPF and Policy 12 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

*Bourton Parish Council objection to this application directly contradicts this statement. Support for local business development is accepted **provided** they:*

12 b) Contribute to the character and vitality of the local area.

– A wellness resort and 20 bed B&B is certainly not in character with the lane.

12 c) Protect residential amenity.

– This application does not. It will directly affect all of the neighbours.

12 d) Not adversely impact upon road safety.

– This application has large negative implications on road safety given the expected traffic.

12 e) Conform to the environmental and other policies in this plan.

– The development will result in the destruction of mature wildlife habitat.

I suggest therefore that this application breaks each of these provisions.

- 2) - Represents a contemporary building that in size, design and siting terms will not have any material impact on the rural or landscape character....

Given the demands of Highways for a 66m entrance clearance which will make the building highly visible from the lane, this statement cannot be substantiated.

- 3) - Will not result in any material impact to the outlook or aural amenity of any neighbouring dwellings. - Is acceptable in its heritage, wildlife and highway impacts.

I strongly suggest that this development will have a huge impact on the outlook and aural amenity of all of the neighbouring dwellings. It also has material impact on wildlife by the destruction of mature hedging, and road safety by the substantial increase in traffic in the lane.

- 4) - Tree loss is minimized to examples that are not worthy of protection and a replacement landscaping scheme has been agreed.

The 66m of mature hedging that highways require to be removed forms part of the rural streetscape of Chaffey Moor Hill. To say that this is unworthy of protection is unfortunate at the very least. The remedial landscaping offered is no replacement for the habitat and heritage destroyed.

There is no support for this commercial development on this site by any of the local community and the Parish Council. It is entirely unsuited to this quiet rural lane.

James Peddle – Against the application

I am a neighbour of Grove Farm on Chaffey Moor Hill and strongly OBJECT to the application for a commercial enterprise which is clearly unsuitable for a very quiet, single-tracked, rural lane.

I would like to draw particular attention to section 4.0, 'Key Planning Issues', and the case officer's observation of 'Access and Parking'. (Case officer notes in italics):

'Sufficient on-site parking available while sight line improvements onto Chaffey Moor Hill will ensure that the free flow of traffic and highway safety will not be adversely affected.'

Very simply, the application shows parking for 8 vehicles including those of the applicants, yet the proposed B&B will provide accommodation for an additional 20 persons. Given the applicants stated desire for the yoga studio to provide space for other practitioners as well as themselves it is fair to assume that this parking provision will prove woefully inadequate and that additional vehicles will need to be accommodated, either on site or on the unlit single track lane.

Bourton NP policy 4 states:

a) The impact of increased traffic resulting from development proposals should not detract from the village character and the rural ambience of roads and lanes and is **a material consideration** in the determination of Planning Applications.

and

c) Any new development or alteration shall ensure that frontages do not become dominated by hard surfacing and parked vehicles.

I would strongly contend that this application contravenes both of these policies.

Despite the Design and Access Statement having been amended (circa-Dec 2021) it remains grossly misleading since much of it is unchanged from when the application was merely for the yoga studio at Grove Farm. The claim within the DAS that the

proposal would have no visual impact on the street scene is patently untrue. With regard to free flow of traffic and highway safety, the highways demand for a clear 66m visibility splay onto Chaffey Moor Hill is a visual, ecological and heritage disaster to create a commercial entrance onto what is currently a rural lane. It is in no way mitigated by the offer to plant a new hedge line some way back from the original.

There is not one voice of support for this development from local residents on Chaffey Moor Hill or indeed the Parish council, who voted unanimously to reject the proposal which is utterly unsuitable for a quiet, single carriageway lane.

Bourton Parish Council – Against the application

Bourton Parish Council OBJECTS strongly to this proposal, for the following reasons:

1. The recently amended Design and Access Statement contains a disingenuous claim, in relation to the impact of the proposed development. The relevant quote from the DAS being: '**... The proposal would have no visual impact on the street scene elevation and is obscured and hidden by existing mature landscaping with new hedgerows to reinforce this privacy. It is concluded then that the development would not introduce demonstrable harm to the amenity of any neighbouring properties**'. This is grossly misleading; the impact on the amenity of neighbours and on the natural environment arising from approval of this development would be immense.
2. The business envisaged at Grove Farm, with its change of classification to C1, would amount to it becoming a 'Wellness' resort. The anticipated increase in traffic volumes would pose a significant risk to pedestrians and horse-riders along Chaffey Moor Hill, a narrow country lane. This would be in contravention of *Bourton Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Policy 4(a): Traffic*.
3. The Highways Authority's visibility solution for the exit from Grove Farm onto Chaffey Moor Hill would entail extensive removal of a high hedge with many mature trees. Creating the visibility splays will have a highly detrimental impact on the secluded character of Chaffey Moor Hill since, as directed by Highways, trees and hedging '**...must be cleared / excavated to a level not exceeding 0.60 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway**'. This would be in direct contravention of *NP Policy 2: Settlement Pattern and Character* and *NP Policy 6: Biodiversity*.
4. Should this application be approved and clearance of trees and hedging as directed be actioned, the yoga studio, attached decking and adjacent pond, which is already used for wild swimming, would be highly visible from the road degrading further the setting of Chaffey Moor Hill.
5. Local residents have already encountered significant noise and unwelcome behaviour from current activities at Grove Farm, which has resulted in complaints being raised with the EA. Accommodating up to 20 guests in Grove Farm will have a much greater detrimental impact on this quiet residential area.

6. The site plan shows parking provision for just 8 vehicles whereas, given the nature of this planning application, the number of cars will be much greater especially if yoga courses (etc.) attract local participants in addition to those staying in Grove Farm's B&B accommodation. Parking for up to 20 vehicles, as would doubtless be required based on the change of use and activities being planned, would mean that the frontage to Grove Farm would become dominated by hard surfacing and parked cars in direct contravention of NP Policy 4(b): Parking.

This application should therefore be REFUSED.

Rebecca Smith, Western Design Architects - Agent

We are pleased that the scheme is supported by Planning, Conservation and Highways Officers following positive and enthusiastic comments through the pre-application enquiry.

Whilst the Parish Council supported the original proposal, they have raised some objections which are representative of public comments following the change of use application and we would like to clarify and dispel any misunderstandings.

The existing access off Chaffeymoor Hill does not meet current highways standards but changes are required to improve the visibility splays in order to address the concerns raised by Dorset Highways.

The work required will reduce the height of existing shrubs to no more than 600mm including the removal of some small self-seeded trees. This could be undertaken outside of this application using permitted development rights but have been included as part of this application for completeness and therefore does not contravene NP Policy 2.

The same visibility splay improvement work was done at Chaffeymoor Grange, a wedding venue sited directly opposite Grove Farm. Other properties on Chaffeymoor Hill benefit from low level hedging and walls to provide adequate visibility splays. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the setting and secluded character of Chaffeymoor Hill but would in fact bring it in line with the existing street scene and character of the area.

The applicant will reinforce the existing hedge-line on their land to maintain privacy screening and to enhance local biodiversity. This screening will also mitigate any visual impact from cars on site. The scheme would not contravene NP Policy 4(c) and 4(b) as there is 233sqm of existing hard landscaping around the house which is ample for visitors, and no further landscaping for vehicle provision is proposed.

Regarding NP Policy 4(a), we would like to stress that the applicants will be living at the property and so numbers of groups for multi-day retreats on-site will be limited to 150 days per year therefore limiting vehicular trip frequency. The transport management plan submitted explains the measures the applicants are taking to reduce vehicular traffic to the site including a collection service from the local train station.

We believe the proposals accord with the neighbourhood plan as a whole, as does your own officer. The scheme has been sensitively designed with neighbours and character of the area in mind, and every effort has been made to ensure it sits sensitively within the wider context. It will provide a small-scale social enterprise within the community, contribute to the character and vitality of the area and provide social and economic benefits.

The proposal meets both National NPPF and local planning policies. As such there should be a presumption in favour of development. I therefore ask that the committee grants approval accordingly.

Item 4b - P/FUL/2021/01429 - Land at E 387256 N 123908, Wincombe Lane, Shaftesbury

Jeff Chown – Support/Against the application

We note the plans indicate connecting a new footpath to the existing footpath 3 at the North West corner of the site. We draw to your attention this is not permissible. The footpath runs over land owned by ourselves and we erected the fence along the Northern boundary of the site over thirty years ago, under the relevant highways act we are obliged to maintain free and unobstructed passage along the route of footpath for the benefit of public pedestrians, we are not however obliged to provide access to the footpath by breaching our boundary fence, this could only be done by ourselves or with our permission.

The current footpath 3 is exactly that and is not for the use of cyclists we are considering re-erecting the stiles at either end of our land that were taken down by ourselves some years ago to aid the free passage of walkers.

Toward the eastern end of Footpath 3 bounding the site is a native indigenous hedge of many species including hazel, within the hedge is a colony of HAZEL DORMICE which is a highly endangered species close to potential extinction and it is therefore vital this area remains undisturbed, I believe this section of footpath 3 bounding the site should be redirected to within the site to preserve the habitat of the dormice and to provide a feeding corridor for the bats that are colonised nearby and feed along the hedgerows of the site.

Gillian Lewis – Against the application

Following COP26 undertakings by UK government and Dorset Council's declaration of a climate emergency, please ensure that conditions are made to this amended application which include requirements for full environmental mitigation actions - including types of building materials (eg. minimal concrete and plastics), sustainable energy generation, solar capture, sewage treatment, road surfaces, water run off and all other high impact aspects - so that this proposed development would meet 21st century climate risk reduction and environmental care needs.

Please set an example and use this and all future planning development decisions to demonstrate Dorset Council's actual commitment to addressing the climate emergency.

Lester Dibben – Against the application

Please would members consider the impact of the development in light of the Design Statement, adopted into the local plan, The COP 26 measures, and the further impact of so much more residential development while so much of the promised infrastructure remains undelivered?

I am concerned Shaftesbury Town Council called off its P&H committee meeting of the 4th of January 2022, this has left a hole in the proper procedure to allow Shaftesbury Residents a voice.

Where I note the application will not be turned down one would expect that all the climate measures possible would be imposed onto this site, before the final decision is made, it appears they are not.

I note Dorset Council declared a "Climate emergency" as a result all appropriate measures must be put in place, otherwise it would seem a pointless declaration.

DC elected members have held no public event or held a STC meeting to ensure all the long list of promises in the adopted Design statement, Ref: the enquiry by design process held over three and a half years under my chairmanship, working with the princes trust. This when added to the current climate disaster requires immediate action to ensure no further damage is done.

Please note most of the promised infrastructure still remains undelivered. Proactive support for the Community Interest Companies proposals well supported would go a long way in addressing some of these issues before further development is undertaken.

Indeed I would expect all current developers to be invited to explain how they are going to fulfil the requirements following COP26 and the up and coming COP27, a public meeting for this event should be called.

Please ensure me and the residents of Shaftesbury that the process will be delayed for a short time to allow residents a voice?

Would you also provide me with Dorset Councils policy backing up its climate emergency declaration and its climate rescue policy along with the named officers and portfolio holders.

Karen Tippins – Against the application

I fail to see how this planning application of a further 162 houses can be granted with the current abysmal record shown by all levels of government in providing Shaftesbury with the required infrastructure to support the rapid town's expansion. Dorset Council appears to be with-holding s106 developer's contributions from Shaftesbury and preventing the town from having the agreed and promised LEAPs, LAPs, cycleways, educational facilities, NHS support and the agreed spine linking road plus East of Shaftesbury bypass corridor. All facilities have been agreed and approved with each Planning Application for:- Parcel 1 through to 7 (700 houses) of the East of Shaftesbury Persimmon developments, Churchill housing Coppice St (43 dwellings), Blue Cedar Bimport (15-20 dwellings) and now Redrow Littledown (170 houses).

Promised infrastructure:-

- Where has the Maple Road link to Wincombe Lane spine road gone; this was a key section of road infrastructure and was a planning obligation for Barratts, why has this been 'dropped' by Highways?
- Where has the importance of the East of Shaftesbury Bypass Corridor gone and the impact of the Barratts development has on making sure this is implemented?

- Why hasn't land been secured for a new primary school in any Local Plan?
- Why isn't there an open and transparent audit trail of how s106 developers' contributions amounting to millions of pounds for Shaftesbury that has been collected by Dorset Council and released to who and on what basis and at which Committee?
- Where are the promised cycleways paid for by s106 contributions to connect the East with the West of Shaftesbury?
- Where has the Affordable Housing Contributions been spent on the back of building houses in Shaftesbury?
- Who is being allocated the Affordable Housing? Why aren't Dorset Council Housing Enabling Team proving to Shaftesbury of this constant Affordable Housing Need is valid and is being correctly allocated?
- Why hasn't Shaftesbury been allocated £3.4M of LEP from Central Government for infrastructure (why has this only gone to Gillingham). Shaftesbury has high priority needs for LEP and has increased in size by over 25%?
- An explanation is needed from DC as to why no new play areas have been implemented in Shaftesbury since 2015. People have moved into their new houses in Shaftesbury, they were promised facilities and yet their roads haven't been adopted by Highways, they are living in a building site type condition for years, they have been provided with no play facilities, no cycleways, no promised community hall – just rows and rows of housing. Barratts can't go ahead until Dorset Council sorts out the current mess in Shaftesbury due to excessive housing build with no infrastructure roll out.

Linda Nunn, Cranbourne Chase AONB – Against the application

The AONB Partnership is disappointed that the applicant has not submitted a lighting strategy and plan for this development that has the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its International Dark Sky Reserve to the north, east, and south of it.

The Partnership strongly advises the Committee to reinforce the proposed Condition 4 as follows [changes in red]:

4. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved above damp-proof course level, a scheme showing precise details of all external lighting (including appearance, supporting columns, siting, technical details, power, intensity, orientation and screening of the lamps) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such scheme shall **also** comply with the lighting requirements **for Environmental Zone 1** as set out **by the Institution of Lighting Professionals and those** in the approved Biodiversity Plan dated 20th April 2021. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the development is occupied and shall be permanently maintained thereafter. No further external lighting shall be installed on site without the prior approval, in writing, of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of the **protection of the AONB and its International Dark Sky Reserve**, **the** amenity of the area, public safety, protected species and biodiversity.

Brian Watts – Against the application

I live at Higher Wincombe House, one of four properties in the Hamlet of Higher Wincombe, which is only accessible via the part of Wincombe Lane that becomes private road as is described as bridleway N1/38. The hamlet itself lies in the Parish of Donhead St Mary, Wiltshire, although is within 170m of the boundary of the proposed site.

The four properties in the hamlet all have easements for right of access along Wincombe Lane. Those easements extend south west of the proposed site and roundabout along Wincombe Lane. At no time were the residents of the hamlet consulted by the developers nor have any of the residents granted permission for the alteration of their easements or the interference thereof. The proposal in your papers today under the section “Highway safety, access and parking “ that a plans for a four-arm roundabout have been submitted to “to improve farm vehicle access north of the previously approved roundabout” again have not been approved by ourselves. The fact that the term “farm vehicle access” is used shows inconsideration of the residents of this hamlet.

Consultation has been initiated with the developers, at the request of the residents of the hamlet, however, that consultation regarding access is ongoing, and to date no amicable access solution has been agreed. Although any development in that location is likely to cause interference, inconvenience and disadvantage to the residents of the hamlet both during and after construction and in fact is already doing so.

A major concern to inconvenience, in addition to the proposed access, is the access along Wincombe Lane. With the primary school in Wincombe Lane, there are already access issues at the start and end of school. With a minimum 381 additional vehicles as suggested by the allocated parking spaces those issues will increase and it is likely that there will also be further issues where Wincombe Lane is reduced to single file width of 3.1 metres just south west of the proposed access.

I request that consideration be given to the concerns raised in this statement and also of the objections of Shaftesbury Town Council in your deliberation on this application.

Liz Evans, Development Manager, Sovereign Housing Association – Supports the application

We are delighted to support this application by David Wilson Homes. Shaftesbury is an area of great affordable housing need and high prices, and approval will help significantly in easing this.

We have in place a formal development agreement with them to deliver the Shared Ownership and Affordable Rented units on the site, which will be delivered progressively throughout the site. We are especially pleased that (compared with the original application) the new scheme brings a greater proportion of the affordable units on-site, giving a greater contribution towards housing needs.

We are satisfied that the units are appropriate in design, size, and configuration to meet local housing needs in the area.

I hope that councillors will take this opportunity to positively address this key priority by granting approval today.

Peter Yeo, Mampitts Lane Community Land Trust CIC – Supports the application

When considering what purpose the Barratts s106 funds should be allocated for, please note that East Shaftesbury is already in great need of a Community Neighbourhood Hall to cater for its already greatly increased population and the Barratts development is not providing any community hall, park or play park.

Fortunately, six permanently unpaid East Shaftesbury residents formed 'The Mampitts Lane Community Land Trust CIC' in July 2020 and have made a planning obligation fulfilling bid to Dorset Council in 2020 (updated in November 2021) to become nominated to take ownership of the s106 Community Land at Mampitts Lane in East Shaftesbury and use existing s106 funds to deliver, own and manage the long overdue Community Hall, Park and Play Park planning obligations at this location.

A petition of 720 supporters was handed in to Dorset Council in 2020 and 2021. The Mampitts Lane Community Land is currently owned by Persimmon Homes and The Mampitts Lane Community Land Trust CIC are the only third party body that has a planning obligation fulfilling bid, and which they guarantee to deliver.

The submitted costed project budget for this bid proposal shows that these Community facilities (designed by our architect and landscape architect) can be delivered successfully within existing s106 funds, however some additional s106 funds from the Barratts Development earmarked for a 'Community Hall and park/play park' would enable an enhanced Community facility to be delivered at the Mampitts Lane s106 Community Land site (the only such site in Shaftesbury) to benefit all Shaftesbury Residents, and especially those in the East, including the Barratts development.

Jon Gateley, Barratt Developments - Applicant

Good morning. Firstly my thanks to the officer for his thorough report and of course, I support the recommendation.

I must underline that the principle of developing this site has been accepted through the Local Plan, the draft Dorset Plan, and the previous permission. You may be aware that initial works have commenced under existing consents, including a revised access granted last year.

This new application improves upon the previous one, with the main changes being:

- Providing 162 not 191 units by reducing density, and omitting a small area south of Wincombe Lane.
- Achieving more affordable (48 units not 29), bringing the full requirement on-site, instead of 15% plus payment.
- A more informal design, reflecting the countryside location, with a less urban structure.
- Delivering a *David Wilson* scheme instead of Barratt, with more up-to-date, efficient designs.

We've worked with officers on amendments, and agree that the design is (in their words) *"acceptable, providing an appropriate setting with the sensitive countryside edge, including landscape mitigation and green space."*

Technical consultees are satisfied, including Highways, Ecology, Rights of Way, Environmental Health, Drainage, Minerals, and Trees. The few objections are mainly on principle, and don't acknowledge existing permissions. But to address the Town Council's main concerns;

- There is no obstruction to the bypass, as confirmed by Highways. The eastern boundary is the same as before, other than a small drainage area.
- The housing stands outside the odour zone.
- Wincombe Lane can accommodate vehicle movements, and these are reduced from before.
- We comply with the affordable requirement (30%, not 40%).
- We provide several footpath connections, and policy compliant greenspace.

We share the Town Council and AONB's concern to minimise visual impacts. But there is little change from the old permission; in fact there's the opportunity for landscape improvement, through details to be approved by condition. There are also habitat and hedgerow gains.

Through our S106 many other benefits are delivered, including:

- £31,662 for footpaths
- £200,000 for leisure/indoor sport,
- £950,000 for education (primary and secondary)
- £54,594 for healthcare,
- £11,700 for libraries
- £446,000 for maintenance/ improvement of existing greenspace, play and sport
- £48,000 for allotments.

If approved, we'd commence before Spring, and these contributions would be paid in tandem.

Overall this application improves on the previous consent, whilst bringing immediate gains, most importantly dealing with the urgent need for housing whilst the Council's supply is just 3.3 years. All 162 units would be delivered within 5 years, with first completions this year. As well as providing homes on an allocated site, this would reduce the Council's exposure at appeals on sites it doesn't want.

So I fully agree with the officer that this proposal represents sustainable development, and would respectfully ask members to grant planning permission.

Item 4c - WD/D/20/003114 - Sandringham Sports Centre, Armada Way, Dorchester

Colin Lawley, Chairman Dorchester Bowls Club – Against the Application

We are surprised this application has been listed for hearing when as far as we are aware you have not adjudicated upon our submission that the application is not valid for failure to comply with the statutory obligation to serve notice on all owners having an interest in the application site. The description "owner" means someone having a freehold interest or a leasehold interest with at least 7 years unexpired in the application site. The reference to application site includes all land necessary to carry out the proposed application (e.g. land required for access to the site from a public highway, landscaping, car parking and open areas around buildings).

The rather draconian wording of sections 65(5) and 327(A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that local planning authorities " must not entertain" applications where statutory requirements to notify owners and certify they have done so have not been met. In the 2018 case of Bishop -v- Westminster Council the Court warned that all involved in the planning process should make sure all title issues are considered and the ownership certificate completed correctly. Recklessness and a cavalier disregard of mandatory requirements can lead to permissions being quashed as was the decision in this case where due care had not been taken. As soon as Dorchester Bowls Club and Dorchester Rifle Club became aware of the application the Council were notified there was an ownership certificate issue but chose to ignore this on being advised by the Town Council they were the only owner required to be served despite they having granted the leases to both clubs with more than 7 years unexpired. These leases granted both clubs parking rights over the whole of the car park including the area now sought to be excavated and built upon. These leases required each lessee to bear a proportion of the cost of the repair and maintenance of the whole of the car park and the Rifle Club building is built on the site and will be overshadowed by the proposed Ballet School. Despite the report of the case officer acknowledging that the Bowls and Rifle Clubs are owners the report continues to assert that our submission of invalidity relates to non service upon the Duchy of Cornwall, the previous freehold owners. We have made it clear this statement is untrue. We continue to assert the application is invalid for failure to comply with statutory requirements when the relevant information was and has been at all times available to the Applicant, the Agents and the Council with the benefit of due care and attention.

Richard Burden, Chairman Dorchester Rifle and Pistol Club – Against the application

Dorchester Rifle and Pistol Club has made a number of submissions since the application was made, and it is still very concerned that

- the online application file makes no mention of this Club's planning permission [22 12 1989] which is a material consideration as an immediate neighbour, and it requires a specific number of identified car parking spaces to be set out,
- neither the applicant nor the architect have accepted invitations to meet and discuss the proposals and the potential impacts on our premises,
- surface water flooding of our premises has occurred twice in the past decade and the proposal will increase runoff, and increase risk to our buildings,
- despite identifying this issue months ago neither the architect nor case officer has sought details from DRPC,
- the drainage report admits no survey has been done, surely a significant shortcoming, and the proposed drains run uphill!
- the Ballet Club has insufficient parking for its needs at its current site,
- the Highway Authority has failed to follow NPPF [2021] 104e and 108 guidance as the proposal reduces the available parking, increases the parking demand, and puts pressure on off site, street, parking,
- there is no provision [NPPF112e] for 'charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles',
- the proposed building is unnecessarily high, industrial in style, and is orientated to obliterate the open grassy bank,
- the proposed scale, cladding, and colour will be depressing, whereas reorientating by 90 degrees along the eastern boundary would retain the green space and provide a more comfortable 'fit' to the location,
- in failing to ascertain relevant facts the agent appears to have been avoiding doing all the constructive things that should be done when seeking to promote a community facility, namely talking with neighbouring clubs / facilities to seek to find a solution that all can support!

It is also worrying that attention to relevant detail is missing from your committee report in that both the name and acronym for this Club are consistently wrong; that does not inspire confidence. Furthermore, the Council cannot choose to opt out of its responsibilities and liabilities for flooding and damage to the DRPC premises if it approves the submitted application; it will be held liable.

DRPC asks the committee to

- a. **defer its decision and**
- b. **instruct the agent / applicant to discuss with neighbours a scheme that the clubs and nearby residents can support.**

Lesley Cocker, Dorchester Ballet and Dance – Applicant

Dorchester Ballet and Dance has been providing not-for-profit affordable dance classes to people of all ages for over 60 years and became a registered charity (number 1087930) in 2000. The school's founder vowed, "Bringing dance to all, regardless of age, wealth or ability".

Unable to find suitable premises the charity currently rents an industrial unit, but the building is small, aging, and inaccessible for many users. A purpose-built facility would allow the dance school to meet the changing health and wellness needs of the local community as well as unmet demand. With current and future housing allocations, Dorchester continues to grow, creating greater need.

Dorchester Town Council has been aware of our search for premises over several years and offered this site in a parking area for which they hold the freehold; they have confirmed that no other party has any rights within the site that would be affected by the development.

The Sandringham site has c. 120 parking spaces. The Town Council have confirmed that parking in the area rarely exceeds two thirds of its capacity. While up to 15 spaces will be lost as a result of the building, many of these will be replaced by remarking the area.

The charity's current premises have use of 11 parking spaces which are rarely full.

The dance school's location on Poundbury Industrial Estate makes it difficult for families to walk to their classes; relocation close to schools and a residential area will increase students' walking and cycling opportunities. The charity will not require coaches to access the site.

Water run-off from the roof will be addressed by new soak-away drainage. A drainage strategy has been outlined by consultants, GAP, and filtration tests undertaken. I understand that a previous flooding event to the rifle club was resolved by maintenance to the existing drainage.

Insulation will meet current building regulations which will also mitigate noise. Construction will be by a reputable building firm and the project overseen by Crickmay Stark Architects. Dencher Consulting Engineers will be responsible for elements of structure including foundations and these will be designed to avoid damage to adjacent buildings – construction will also need to meet Building Controls.

Dorchester Ballet and Dance is committed to green initiatives and is exploring the inclusion of solar panels, air-source heat pumps and EV charging facilities. Low Carbon Dorset will be consulted until the conclusion of their programme.

The studio's outward appearance and hours of use are in keeping with the existing leisure facilities at the site.

Thank you for the opportunity to address questions raised by local residents and businesses.

Item 4d - P/FUL/2021/03534 - Cheselbourne Village School, Drakes Lane, Cheselbourne

No Representations

Item 4e - P/FUL/2021/03872 - Cerne Abbas Church of England First School, Duck Street, Cerne Abbas

School Council, Cerne Abbas First School

We are the School Council from Cerne Abbas CE VA First School and we have heard that some people are not happy about our school having solar panels on both sides of the school roof.

We want to help our environment as much as we can and do what we can to stop our earth getting polluted.

We are still quite young and we want the world we grow up in to be a healthy place for us as well as our children and their children too. Having solar panels on both sides will not only help keep our world healthy but will also help reduce the cost of our bills and we could spend that money on resources to help our learning.

We would like to do everything we can to help our world no matter how small. We feel so lucky that someone would pay for solar panels to enable us to do this. Our vision is to be the best we can and feel that by caring for our environment it enables us to do the best we can for our environment.

Please let us have solar panels on both sides of the road to help us help the world.

Thank you very much.

From Cerne Abbas CE VA First School Council

Derek Moss, Dorset Council Assets and Property – Applicant

This statement is about the application for solar panels on Cerne Abbas and Sticklands Schools, where the amount of solar PV outlined in the application is at risk of being significantly reduced based on the aesthetic considerations of Conservation officers.

DC has been successful in a grant application for carbon reduction technology installations which is 100% funding, so a once in a lifetime opportunity. Indeed subsequent phases of this funding scheme now require significant match funding. The key grant restriction is that it has to be spent (i.e. technologies installed) by end March 2022, in line with the need for urgent climate action. Any solar PV not installed now is at significant risk of not being installed for many years. The extra panels, as well as doubling emissions reductions, would help reduce running costs for the schools, which in turn allows the installation of renewable heating systems. This is because renewable heating systems are more expensive to run than fossil fuel ones, and no schools can accept increased running costs when their budgets are already under such pressure. Without the full PV arrays, the conversion to renewable heating is at serious risk of not proceeding now or in the future. And so the potential effect of reducing the size of the installations is greater than just the direct carbon savings from the PV panels. For these sites, there are no suitable alternative renewable heating technologies available, as they are off the gas grid (instead using oil).

Solar panels are temporary and can be taken down at the end of their useful life to return the roof to its original state. There will be no physical damage to the buildings.

DC has recognised the urgency and importance of the climate issue by declaring a Climate Emergency. This implies that we have acknowledged that we can't just keep on doing the same things as we have always done that have created the emergency; something needs to change: such as giving emissions reductions more weight in planning decisions when compared to temporary changes to aesthetics. This is arguably a very simple (and cheap!) thing to do but the first of many changes that need to occur.

Whilst we fully respect the need to maintain aesthetics in some circumstances there is a need to balance that against the climate and ecological emergency. In these instances, we feel that the benefit of the solar installation is far greater for the local community, Dorset and beyond, than the subjective effect on aesthetics.

The action taken on climate change now will determine the outcomes for the planet and future generations who inhabit it. We would urge the planning decisions taken today to place the necessary weight on these considerations, and the proposed planning applications which are very much in line with the recognised science, and emergency declared at both an international and national level and by Dorset Council.

Item 4f - P/FUL/2021/04519 - Stickland's CE VA Primary School, Evershot

Eco-Committee, Stickland's CE VA Primary School

We, the children of Stickland's Primary School, ask that you reconsider the amount of solar panels installed on our school. We understand that in our idyllic conservation area, you may fear that it reduces our school buildings appearance, but, sadly, our school *will not* have an appearance if we continue to let climate change prevail over us and do nothing to prevent it. So, investing in solar panels would truly be a good addition to our beautiful area with a positive outcome to the village as well.

Yes, solar panels aren't the prettiest but they would have several benefits to our school including helping to reduce the amount of fossil fuels we use. They are also more energy efficient; imagine our conservation area with less fossil fuels – how many animals and their eco systems will thrive greater than ever before? So when the future generation asks us why we didn't do anything about climate change whilst we still had the chance, what will we say? Simply we couldn't be bothered or yet another dismal excuse?

So why don't we act now, as we still have the chance. By installing the solar panels, it will enable us to save money so we will be able to buy more resources; as a small school all financial gains are incredibly important, additionally what we can buy, may be eco-friendlier.

This is our school, and we want to protect it. The more solar panels we have the greater and more positive affect it has on our planet. Hopefully other schools will follow in our path (if we get the desired amount), and then Dorset will be much more eco. Surely this is a good thing?

So many children in our small school care about our beautiful planet and are looking to you to ensure the future of our natural area is secure and stable – a well-balanced eco system.

Here are what the children in our school think:

"We wish for the total amount of solar panels, so that future generations have a better home." Nikola (Y5)

"I think that it is important that everybody has a valued life - that climate change won't harm that. We are the children and our school is the future. We want to live happily." Felice (Y6)

In conclusion, we ask you, as a school and a community, to reconsider the amount of solar panels you will give us as the advantages are truly substantial, for all.

Yours sincerely

Bea, Chloe and Nikola (speaking on behalf of all the children at Stickland's School)

Kathy, McCann, Headteacher, Stickland's Primary School

Ahead of the planning meeting to discuss the solar panels at Stickland's School, I would like you to please consider the following:

- Currently our heating system uses oil. Clearly this is not an eco-friendly fuel, it is becoming, and in the future will become ever more expensive. A switch to solar power would help to address the environmental impact of the fuel that we currently use.
- As a small school, with an ever shrinking budget, we have had to cut back on many things for the children and within the school. Unfortunately we are almost at the point of needing to consider redundancies for staff, so again, any other savings that can be made would benefit all within the school.
- As a whole school - pupils and staff, we are very conscious of our impact on the environment. Solar panels will help to reduce our carbon footprint. Whilst we fully appreciate that Evershot is a conservation area, we believe that solar panels are becoming much more accepted due to their positive impact. I believe that the benefit of having them fitted must be considered, as the negative impact that we, as humans are having on the world needs to be reversed.
- Solar panels will not change the architectural and historic interest of the school or the village .

Item 4g - P/HOU/2021/04457 - 6 Culliford Road, Dorchester

No Representations