

**Northern Area Planning Committee**  
**Written Submissions**  
**8 February 2022**

**Item 5 – P/OUT/2021/04019 – Common Mead Lane, Gillingham**

**Malcolm Briggs – Against the application**

I object to the proposed development of land to the north of Common Mead Lane and contend this is not a proper application, which should either be an Appeal or a full submission of a proposal, rather than this attempt to deal with the reasons for previous refusal as if they were reserved matters. The developers themselves admit it is re-submission of the original proposal; in which case, it should be refused in the same way or the Council could leave itself open to a claim of abuse of process and, inevitably, calls for a Judicial Review.

The only real difference between this application and the previous one that was refused is the inclusion of an additional field which the developers say they will leave. This is not included in the original proposal or the indicative plans and therefore cannot now be considered as part of this application. The promise is neither practical nor subsequently enforceable and will lead to creeping development across the fields, until it reaches the Wyke Conservation Area.

The proposals fly in the face of very many policies in the Neighbourhood Plan which identifies this land as informal recreation or Accessible Natural Green Space.

It also is not suitable to be considered under Paragraph 11d of the Planning Framework (presumed approval for sustainable development), as it fails on all three criteria:

- 1) There is a robust Neighbourhood Plan which was only adopted by County in July 2018, and not 2010 as stated by the applicants in their Addendum; currently being reviewed
- 2) There is a 91% identified housing supply for the next 10 years
- 3) The site is not sustainable on the grounds of there being no public transport.

The reasons why this application should be refused are very similar to the 2021 Stalbridge Appeal which was also refused and this gives a clear indication on how ribbon development in a rural area should be assessed. This appeal dismissed the same stated benefits including s106 monies and increased Council Tax as being of no distinct benefit. Stalbridge has a much lower achievement of identified housing supply and yet this was not held to be a sufficient reason for suburban sprawl.

This is a much-loved, open green space which people really use – we estimate there are 50,000 visits a year to it and it has represented the western-most boundary of the township for 40 years. A development that will involve hundreds of additional vehicle movements a day has no place here and we implore the committee to reject the application again and wait for the applicants to Appeal, which we believe they would lose based on the Stalbridge Appeal.

## **Philip Walker – Against the application**

I object to the above proposed development.

**Existing planning policies:** The proposed development is for a high density housing estate outside the settlement boundary, it is a greenfield site, and is subject to countryside policies where development should be strictly controlled. In addition, part of the site is situated within an area designated as an Important, Open or Wooded Area (IOWA).

**Design, appearance and density of proposed development:** Eighty proposed dwellings will exceed the height and massing of neighbouring buildings and doesn't respect the character and distinctiveness of the locality. It is more appropriate for a town centre suburban location. It does not provide any new green infrastructure to improve the quality of life for residents.

**Traffic issues:** The site is where Common Mead Lane narrows to a single track lane. The lane is in poor condition. After rain, excess water travels directly down the lane, becoming icy in winter conditions. In addition to cars, the road is used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. This road cannot take additional traffic from 80 households without substantial investment.

**Infrastructure and other housing developments:** There are 3 other development programmes which meet Gillingham's contribution to new housing in Dorset: Barnaby Mead, which is nearing completion, redevelopment of the old Co-op site, and the Southern Extension (1800 houses, some of which are already advertised for sale.) Unlike at the Southern Extension, Fairfax have no plan for infrastructure.

**Impact on ecology and biodiversity:** Fairfax's biodiversity plan recorded 6 different species of bat during activity surveys at the site, **including Serotine bats which have a vulnerable conservation status in England.** Other protected species identified were **great crested newts.** In addition, other reptiles, badgers, hedgehogs, barn owls, nesting birds are all to be found in the field area (as reported by Fairfax themselves). Plus deer have been seen. The success of the mitigation proposals and habitat creation scheme put forward by Fairfax cannot be guaranteed. The very process of creating a building site of such a size over many months will inevitably have a catastrophic impact on the local ecology.

**Climate change:** Dorset Council has already declared a "climate emergency". Disturbing a large grassland area will undermine the government's emissions target, as disturbance of fields releases carbon back into the atmosphere. A report in *Dorset Wildlife* magazine (Winter 2020 p13) states the following: "UK grasslands store 2 billion tonnes of carbon, but disturbance of soils release millions of tonnes each year." More information is available in a joint report by the WWF and RSPB: *The role of nature in a UK NDC (Nationally Determined Contribution).*

## **Sarah English – Against the application**

I strongly object to the above planning application and believe it should be refused on the following grounds:

The proposed housing development is outside the defined settlement boundary of Gillingham. It is on a greenfield site and impinges on the Wyke Conservation Area. **The proposal is contrary to policies 2, 5, 20 of the adopted North Dorset Plan part 1 and paras 11, 202 and 203 of the NPPF.**

There is no **obvious over riding public benefit** to be derived from building a large housing development of 80 homes or more on this site.

The proposed Common Mead Lane site is **unsuitable** and **unsustainable** for a housing development of this kind. The only local "amenities" within the "acceptable" 400m to 1 kilometre distance from the site is a bus stop, where apparently no buses stop, and a local convenience store.

Fairfax's own Transport Assessment estimates there would be an extra **392** "trips" within a **12-hour period** to and from the housing site. If this figure is added to the number of trips currently made to and from the Mellows Care Home, according to the Transport Assessment the total would reach **501** 'trips' over a **12-hour period**.

This **extra volume of traffic** travelling daily along Common Mead Lane, and trying to turn left or right into the busy Wyke Road (B3081) would result in **increased traffic congestion, increased traffic pollution** and may well create **an accident black spot** at The Common Mead Lane/Broad Robin junction into the busy Wyke Road as all this extra daily traffic tries to turn right or left into the busy Wyke Road, (B3081) where the traffic flow is almost continual. Also, the proposed access road leading into and out of the housing development is very close to the point where Common Mead Lane becomes a narrow, windy single track land with poor visibility and relatively few passing places.

The proposed development would result in **the loss** of an informal recreational area which also provides **easy access** to open countryside and **a green space** where **out door sports** can be played and is **specifically contrary to Policies 17 and 6 of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan adopted in July 2018.**

There is **no need** for more housing developments in Gillingham. Gillingham is one of the fastest growing towns in the South West. With two other housing developments in progress, Barnaby Mead and the planned Southern extension (1800 houses), **housing quotas** in this town are already **well on target** for 2032.

### **Michael Cridge – Against the application**

With the Southern extension now started and two BROWN field sites in Gillingham town itself with one site already under construction, this proposed development on a GREEN field site contributes nothing to the community it only detracts from the shrinking available green community space, we don't need a man made attempt at creating wildlife areas we already have natural ones, the proposed play areas, adjacent to a road, cannot replace the existing open green space for all to enjoy, this application offers nothing to the community it only detracts and should be refused.

### **Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan Committee – Against the application**

This objection is made from the perspective of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan published in July 2018.

May we bring the Committee's attention to Policies 17, 19 and 22 of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan. This application could not be more clearly in breach of those policies. Those policies represent the wishes, desires and aspirations of the community of Gillingham. The number of objections to this application, without doubt, reinforces and illustrates those wishes, desires and aspirations.

Since the making of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan there have been applications for over 2,000 dwellings with provision for a further 200 at Station Road. There is the prospect of further windfall applications. Gillingham's housing needs are already catered for. A sufficient number and range of homes are already provided for. The removal of this land from the identified area in the Neighbourhood Plan for outdoor sport provision clearly does not support the Communities health, social or cultural wellbeing.

The provision of s106 monies cannot be considered in all cases to be an appropriate form of compensation for failing to provide for example outdoor sports provision or allotments. Land has to be made available for such matters, not developed. If there is no land available in suitable and appropriate areas then the s106 monies cannot be used to provide these facilities.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and that there are three overarching objectives:

- The economic objective will not be met as the proposal does not support growth, innovation, and improved productivity in the long term.
- The social objective will not be met as the proposal does not bring forward accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being.
- The environmental objective will not be met as the proposal does not contribute towards the protection and enhancement of our natural, built, and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently.

The application is contrary to Policy 17 of the North Dorset Local Plan as the proposal will be piecemeal and premature. It will not bring forward housing in a comprehensive and coordinated manner, as agreed through the Master Plan Framework, and will be detrimental to infrastructure delivery for Gillingham.

For the reasons mentioned the application is contrary to the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan, the North Dorset Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore the application should be rejected.

**Gillingham Town Council**

Gillingham Town Council recommends **refusal** of Application No. P/OUT/2021/04019 for the following reasons:

- The site is outside the settlement boundary and encroachment into the countryside would cause harm to the significance of the Wyke Conservation Area, and the non-designated Moat at Thorngrove. The harm would not be outweighed by the benefits derived from the development and is contrary to policies 2, 5, 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan (NDLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Gillingham has a deficit of 86.5 acres of amenity green space. The development would result in the loss of an existing area of informal green amenity space, and a formal area of search for new outdoor sports provision and is contrary to policies 15 of the NDLP and policies 17 and 22 of the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan (GNP), and paragraph 98 and 99 NPPF.
- The application suggests that formal outdoor sports and informal outdoor space can be provided for through s106 funding. How can this be achieved when the land allocated in the neighbourhood plan for sports provision is developed for housing. There are no other suitable areas in Gillingham on which to provide much needed amenity land.
- The site is served by a sub-standard rural lane which is single carriageway width with no footways or usable highway verges. The lane is well used by the residents of Mulbury Court and the service users of Employ My Ability, many of whom use mobility scooters. Additional vehicle movements will adversely impact upon the safety of highway users; rendering the application un-sustainable. The Transport Assessment submitted by the applicant is flawed being based on estimated traffic movements using the 2011 Census which is now 11 years out of date. The vehicle movement assessment was undertaken in November 2020 whilst the UK was in lockdown and traffic movements restricted.
- There is no public transport available. Occupants will be reliant on private vehicles which is not sustainable and contrary to the NPPF.
- The development will result in the loss of amenity to the neighbouring residential care-home which is contrary to Policy 25 of the NDLP.
- At least six different species of bat were recorded during the surveys, including the vulnerable Serotine Bat. The Ecology Survey confirms the presence of great crested newts and states that the development will result in the destruction of their terrestrial habitat. This adverse effect on ecology and biodiversity cannot be mitigated against.
- The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The proposed development does not meet the objectives of the NPPF and the harm caused by the application significantly outweighs the benefits.

**Nicole Stacey, PCL Planning – Agent**

On behalf of the applicants, I endorse your officer's recommendation for approval of this outline application.

The application is a resubmission of the earlier application discussed at committee in August last year.

This application has sought to address the matters raised by members, which ultimately formed the reasons for refusal of the earlier application.

The Council's Conservation Officer agrees with the applicant's Heritage Impact Assessment, and considers that the impact of the proposals to nearby heritage assets equate to "*less than substantial harm*" and the public benefits of the scheme substantially outweigh any harm.

With regards to loss of open space, the site is privately owned. Whilst there are existing public rights of way through the site, it is not a designated area of public open space.

The site is identified in the Neighbourhood Plan as one of a number of 'areas of search for potential outdoor sports provision'. Pre-application discussions held with the Town Council confirmed that no further work had been undertaken in relation to such sites and no use of the land for sports provision had been identified. Neither the Town Council, nor sports clubs, have made any formal approaches to the landowner regarding such a use, since the Neighbourhood Plan was made.

The Town Council did express an interest in securing more informal public amenity space. The applicants have offered the land to the north of the application site (extending to 8ha), which was previously intended to be retained by the landowner, to be transferred to the Town Council for this purpose and this forms part of the S106 Heads of Terms. This would ensure the land remains as open space in perpetuity. The Council has confirmed that the agreed Section 106 contributions are sufficient for the ongoing maintenance of this land, should the Town Council accept the offer to transfer.

The latest housing delivery test found that delivery was 69% of the requirement over the last 3 years. The presumption in favour of development therefore applies. This site has been identified by the Council as an allocation for residential development in the emerging Dorset Local Plan.

We are therefore strongly of the view that there are no adverse impacts associated with the scheme which outweigh the range of substantial benefits, which include:

- provision of 20 much needed affordable homes
- creation and support of local jobs
- biodiversity enhancements
- provision of open space and play, including a substantial area of adjacent land, to the north, which is offered for public recreation and enjoyment.
- financial contributions towards enhanced community infrastructure including healthcare, education, libraries, sports provision and local bus services.

We therefore hope you support your officer's recommendation and approve this outline application.

## **Item 6 – P/RES/2021/01690 – Higher Blandford Road, Cann**

### **Karen Tippins – Against the application**

There is already excessive house building that has taken place in Shaftesbury without any roll out of required infrastructure and without Dorset Council releasing much needed s106 developer's contributions for the community's infrastructure. The last (small) Play Area built was in 2015 valued at only £28,000 using s106 from Persimmon, and yet over 800 houses have been built in Shaftesbury. Open Spaces have been left by developers and are unkempt with no equipment and have been in a dreadful state for years, submissions to address the need for community facilities to Dorset Council appears to take too long to move forward and still no delivery of community facilities. Roads are not getting adopted by Dorset Highways, and again, this goes on for years, if not a decade.

Dorset Council officers have stated officially to a Developer (Nylo Homes) there is an acute need for Affordable Housing in Shaftesbury for the controversial planning application 2/2020/0677/OUT. A Dorset Council officer stated 660 Affordable Houses needed, which locals believe to be a 'made up' figure by Dorset Council. There is no supporting evidence for any of these housing numbers supplied by Dorset Council to validate their authenticity. Also, the Affordable Houses are being transferred by developers to the company, Sovereign Housing, who don't appear to be giving these affordable houses to Locals. Why are these Affordable houses being built on valuable agricultural land, right next to the AONB and yet there is no visibility or justification or confirmation by Dorset Council that the houses really are going to locals. In the Dorset Council committee papers for this planning application, it states that there is an absence of a 5 year supply (section 2.0, bullet point 3), again, there are no statistics given to support this statement, at the Sth A30 135 housing planning application Planning Appeal, Dorset Council officers stated that Shaftesbury housing is 'saturated' and 'ahead of the curve' and yet for this planning application, Dorset Officers are saying the opposite. The arguments appear on 'grant' or 'refuse' appears to flip flop according to a desired 'outcome' and not based on brownfield site/greenfield/sensitive area. Please stop approving developments for Shaftesbury until you've proved to residents in Shaftesbury that the required infrastructure has been put in place to be able to cope with a further population expansion of the town.

In addition, please stop approving more houses until Dorset Council has a comprehensive renewable energy technology planning policy which mandates that developers must incorporate every possible and feasible technological solution possible for maximising the usage of renewable energy. It is a known policy 'gap' by the planning committee and there should be an action plan to address this key policy omission.

### **Bernard Ede – Against the application**

Whilst acknowledging that some positive changes have been made in response to earlier comments, there remain significant short-comings.

I therefore Object to the above Application for the following reasons;

1 NO OVERALL SUSTAINABILITY CONCEPT nor STRATEGY; Contemporary measures for low-energy consumption, orientation of dwellings for solar gain, use of sustainable materials, recycling, stormwater management aren't addressed.

2 DETRIMENTAL VISUAL IMPACT;

There are no computer-based depictions of visual impact of the development & mitigating landscape measures from the AONB nor from the A30 towards the Chalk Downland skyline.

The development is within the setting of the AONB & detracts from it.

There's no representation of outward views from the development towards the public open-space nor AONB.

3 INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER;

The character is that of stand-alone, dense urbanisation in an isolated open field in Shaftesbury's rural hinterland.

It does not appear "landscape-led".

4 NO SUDS;

A conventional piped surface water drainage system is proposed, discharging to a large, publicly inaccessible detention basin.

The site plan lacks permeable paving, rainwater-collection tanks, rain gardens, swales (shallow grass ditches), & soakage areas which could retard rapid surface-water runoff & form an armature for the landscape structure threading through the development.

5 NO LOGICAL PLANTING STRATEGY;

There's no tree species & size hierarchy such as large native trees, 'Parkland', wetland, road & footway avenues, parking areas, domestic gardens.

Similarly, there's no hedge hierarchy such as native outer perimeter, semi-native park & roadside edges, & decorative species confined to domestic locations.

Magnolia along the entrance road & Hornbeam in the wetland area are inappropriate species

6 CONFLICT WITH EXISTING TREES;

Two existing large Oak in the A30 verge aren't shown in the proposals despite depiction on the site survey.

Two dwellings & combined footway/cycleway immediately abut these & will jeopardise their survival.

7 ROAD & PARKING INTRUSION INTO OPEN SPACE; Access roads off the entrance road to dwellings & visitor parking intrude into the open space & views to the development from the C13.

There is no screen planting such as hedging.

8 DWELLINGS IMMEDIATELY ABUT OPEN SPACE; A large section of the public open space perimeter is abutted by dwellings, walls & fences, whereas the Outline Scheme showed gardens & hedges.

9 FOOTWAYS IMMEDIATELY ABUT ENTRANCE ROAD; These appear superfluous unless they link to other footways & a road crossing. They create the impression of an over-engineered, hard, urban environment at the entrance.

10 NO LIGHTING DETAILS ;



In relation to Dark Skies Policy, views from AONB & how they interact with tree planting.

#### 11 NO MAINTENANCE ZONING PLANS;

Zones of maintenance operations should be defined on plan & distinction made between establishment & maturation maintenance, including replacement conditions in the event of plant failure. Long-term maintenance responsibility should be defined.

### **Shaftesbury Town Council**

Whilst the applicant has made revisions to the architecture of the development, we continue to object to the overall design, being neither modern nor rural in appearance. Of equal concern is the material harm we feel this application will inflict on the rural nature of the approach to our historic town and the fact that the site acts as the gateway to the Cranborne Chase AONB from Shaftesbury. We are also concerned that there is no provision for solar gain, either in the orientation of the houses or any proposed installations, to ensure a sustainable development.

We would like to draw the Committee's attention to the following policies:

NPPF, Paragraph 12, Achieving well-designed places, point 26. The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve

#### North Dorset Local Plan 2016, (NDLP) Policy 24: Design

Development should be designed to improve the character and quality of the area within which it is located. Proposals for development will be required to justify how the relevant aspects of development form address the relevant design principles and standards set out in Figures 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3 of this policy and how the design responds to the local context.

#### NPPF, Paragraph 13. Protecting Green Belt land

137. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

#### Paragraph 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

152. The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate.... It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions,

#### Planning for climate change

153. Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change,  
155. To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should:

a) provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources

#### Paragraph 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

174. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes,
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside

NDLP, Policy 3: Climate Change

- b) be designed to make best use of solar radiation and passive cooling through the incorporation of passive solar design principles;

Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan: SFDH1; SFDH2; SFDH3; SFDH6; SFDH7; SFGI2; SFGI3; SFGI4

We request full weight is given to the submissions by Dorset Council's Senior Landscape Architect and Chartered Landscape Architect Bernard Ede; we wholly endorse their observations and objections.

We request that no works of any kind should commence until objections raised in these submissions are mitigated by improved cladding proposals to the buildings and all landscaping issues have been addressed with revised plans.

### **Melbury Abbas and Cann Parish Council**

We refer to the above. We concur with the points that Shaftesbury Town Council made concerning this application.

Please note that approximately 50% of these proposed houses will actually be in the parish of Cann and not Shaftesbury and we want to ensure that the proportion of Section 106 monies that will be applicable will be forwarded to this Parish.

Also we wish to reiterate that the entrance for this proposed estate is on to a 'B' road and not a major 'A' road as indicated in the documentation.

### **Gregg Allison, Persimmon Homes – Applicant**

Firstly, I would like to extend my gratitude to the Council for putting in the arrangements for this meeting to take place. I would also like to take this opportunity to commend your Officers for the positive and proactive way in which they have dealt with this application.

With regard to the merits of the proposal, this is a site that already benefits from outline planning permission, granted at appeal, for up to 55 dwellings.

The outline planning application was supported by illustrative details, informed by a LVIA that satisfied the Inspector that would be no unacceptable harm to the nearby AONBs. Had the Inspector believed that the development of the site was not acceptable in a form similar to that illustrated, then permission would have been withheld. This is the starting point for the consideration of this application.

In light of the findings of the Inspector, the design of this scheme deliberately aligns with the outline permission, including the retention of the views. This application proposes two-storey family housing, in keeping with residential character of the area that has regard to its sensitive setting.

The materials will taken into account those used in the vicinity. High quality brick will predominate with muted roof tiles to reduce their visual impact, particularly from long views. Stone fronted properties are proposed in key locations to add interest and refer back to the historic character of Shaftesbury.

Each property is to have high quality detailing and, as can be seen from the various revisions to the scheme, many amendments have been secured, including the provision of street trees, all to the overall betterment of the scheme.

Every home will have its own garden and parking. High quality and resilient landscaping is proposed throughout the site.

The submitted Sustainability Statement sets out the efficiencies of the houses above the Building Regulations baseline and details the infrastructure to be provided for electric car charging and solar PV panels.

Our developments often utilise local tradespeople and contractors. The group's average private selling price is significantly lower than the national average for newly built homes and around 50% are sold to first time buyers. The Group's HBF customer satisfaction has been ahead of the five star threshold since January 2020, illustrating the continued success of The Persimmon Way programme which aims to ensure we build good quality homes consistently.

In summary, the overall benefits of the development, notably the contribution towards the Council's recognised housing needs, would outweigh any short term impacts of the development.

I hope that these brief comments are helpful in determining the application.

## **Item 7 – P/FUL/2021/02870 – Land South of Newlands Manor House, Charlton Marshall**

### **Charlton Marshall Parish Council**

The Parish Council have no comments or objections in respect of the design and layout of the proposed development. But note that no detail has been provided in respect of the heights of the proposed houses, and it is not clear how visible they will be in the landscape, nor what their relative height would be to any new planting in the first few years.

There are however concerns around the location of the entrance/exit:

- The high volume of traffic using this major road (A350). Residents in the area already report difficulties turning out of driveways onto the road, the volume of traffic will be increased again by the Bellway development.
- Speed of traffic – although the major part of the A350 through the village is 30mph the Community Speedwatch team regularly record vehicles travelling at much higher speeds.
- This site is at the limit of the 30mph and therefore vehicles approaching from Blandford (on the site side) will be approaching at a greater speed.
- Due to the high volume and speed of traffic any pedestrian crossing consideration should be of a pedestrian controlled type, to ensure vehicles stop in both directions, particularly for the safety of children needing to cross this road.

The Parish Councillors were impressed with the reports from Dr Weir (Senior Conservation Officer) and Katherine Van Etten (Senior Landscape Architect) and would endorse KVE's comments.

## **Item 8 – 3/20/1328/FUL – Frogmore Lane, Sixpenny Handley**

### **Stuart McLean – Against the application**

My name is Stuart McLean and I wish to object in the strongest terms to the proposed planning application by Rushmore Estates and Midsummer Homes to site 7 new houses on the site of the field located at the junction of Frogmore Lane and Back Lane in Sixpenny Handley.

I have lived in Frogmore Farmhouse, which is located immediately opposite the proposed development site, for 25 years in which time the roadway in Frogmore Lane and Frogmore field opposite have flooded to a serious degree on four separate occasions, most recently in the winter of 2013/14

The junction of Frogmore Lane and Back Lane, where I live, lies at the very lowest point of the village, geographically speaking, which means that the combination of surface water and underground sewerage water combine above and below ground at this very junction, which at periods of excessive inclemency mean that the field and roadway flood to such depths that I lose access to my own house entrance on Frogmore Lane and have to revert to access from Back Lane .

I trust that you will be aware that this is not the first time that such an application has been submitted to develop this same field. In 1989 an application was made (Number 3/89/0773) by Rushmore Estates to build houses on the field. The Parish Council objected to this development on the grounds of surface water flooding in the immediate area. East Dorset District Council agreed with the Parish view and rejected the application. The developer, (O'Rourke plc) appealed the rejection and the Secretary of State appointed an Inspector to intervene. In 1992 he upheld the District Council's rejection in his 3 page report dated 3rd August 1992. The Inspector, in his report, said that he considered one of the main issues in the case to be whether surface water could be disposed of satisfactorily without leading to flooding on the site and elsewhere. In his conclusions at the end of his report the Inspector said: *"I have strong doubts that the problem of water backing up and onto the site can be overcome. I have concluded that surface water cannot be disposed of satisfactorily without leading to flooding on the site and elsewhere. I hereby dismiss this appeal"* Nothing, I would submit, has changed since that planning inspector's report which is as valid today as it was in 1992.

### **Mr A. Lithgow – Against the application**

This application by Rushmore Farms Ltd and Midsummer Homes Ltd for seven new homes has been slightly amended this time around but it is substantially the same as the one submitted two years ago.

Therefore it will come as no surprise to anyone that my objection is the same as the one I put forward in 2020.

My concern is the flood risk that the development scheme poses not only to the proposed new homes but to those existing properties adjoining the development site – and to the surrounding roads as well.

The site has been flooded FOUR times in the previous 23 years during heavy rain.

Just 18 months ago, part of the field next to the site and the nearby highways, including Frogmore Lane and Back Lane, were awash with water after a downpour lasting barely 30 minutes.

Pictures have been taken of this event by a local parish councillor and are available on request.

I dread to think of what might have happened had the houses, envisaged in this plan, been built at the time.

In 1992 a planning inspector appointed by the then Secretary of State for the Environment upheld East Dorset District Council's decision to refuse planning permission to develop the Frogmore Lane field because of the flood perils involved.

Since then, meteorological experts have been warning consistently of the prospect of far more extreme rainy spells in the years to come due to the impact of climate change – a prediction endorsed by the respected environmental organisation Greenpeace which has recently declared that houses should never be built on land liable to flood.

The applicants themselves are clearly aware of the dangers. In their application document two years ago, in answer to the question 'Is the site within an area at risk of flooding?' they ticked the YES box.

I am puzzled as to how they could ever hope to get a decent price for these homes on the open market, given the risks involved.

That is assuming, of course, that properties are intended for sale, as opposed to being built as holiday lettings to cater for the staycation boom caused by the continuing uncertainty over foreign travel.

I ask the committee to reject this application.

### **Ian & Jackie Mereweather – Against the application**

We strongly object to the proposed development in Frogmore Lane. The risk/benefit analysis of this application for only seven properties in this village is not attractive.

1. The developers have provided no substantial evidence or a convincing argument that the flooding risks which have previously been the basis for refusal of consent (in 1992) have diminished. The arguments they have deployed on past flooding to support their application have been shown to be selective and subjective. The actual evidence of experience provided by me and other villagers who have lived here for many years clearly supports a basis for concern.

2. Wessex Water acknowledges the particular issues that have arisen regarding foul water dispersal in the village and have raised them during this application. To date

little substantial additional work to upgrade foul water defences have been put in place.

3. The application includes proposals to now include access off Red Lane. A narrow, tricky single track road which is used as a commuter "rat run" to bypass the village centre. This development has the potential to significantly increase the probability for traffic accidents and risk to pedestrians.

4. There are other areas within the village envelope which provide opportunity for further residential development including affordable housing which attract none of the attendant flooding risk or traffic risk that this application brings.

### **Mrs W Vaughan – Against the application**

I am writing to you to express my opposition to planning application 3/20/1328/FUL.

This is for seven new houses with garages and ancillary car parking at Frogmore Lane, Sixpenny Handley.

My objection is on the same grounds as it was the last time a planning application for the same site was submitted two years ago.

I do not see that the flood risk assessment and surface water strategy amendment contained in the very latest application alters the situation in any meaningful way.

Put simply, I believe now, as I did before, that the development will expose the new houses, and existing homes next to the site, to the threat of flooding.

I do not think the situation has changed since a Government Inspector rejected plans for housing on the site 30 years ago, citing the flood risk as his reason for doing so.

His fears have been amply confirmed by several flooding incidents over the past few years, one of the worst being in August 2020 when parts of Frogmore Lane and Back Lane were left under water after a rain storm lasting less than half an hour.

Photos of this event can be supplied if required.

It should be born in mind that, according to the Met Office, our changing climate will mean that these extreme weather episodes will increasingly become the norm, rather than the exception.

Please reject this latest application.

### **Colin & Louise Chambers – Against the application**

We wish to object in the strongest possibly way, to the proposed development in respect of planning application 3/20/1328/FUL.

As a resident of Paddock Close for the last 32 years this field has been the subject of several planning proposals, all of which have been rejected by residents and Sixpenny Handley & Pentridge Parish Council.

The field in question is located to the east of the village and is the lowest point within the boundary of Sixpenny Handley, the site is a natural soakaway for water runoff for most of the village and as a result often floods in frequent prolonged and heavy rain into Frogmore Lane and Back Lane and then into Manor Farm and farmhouse.

The River Allen runs under the village along Dean Lane eastward to Frogmore Lane and, then towards the A345 when it rises above ground generally in the Winter, the area is listed by the Environment Agency as a flood plain.

We are aware that our Parish Council do not object to further development of the village, and a number of new developments have recently taken place, along with new planning permission for 12 houses with access from Back Lane, our objection is to the development of sites that are subject to regular and serious flooding.

Governments are now insisting that ZERO carbon emissions are a target to reverse the effects of Global Warming which is leading to severe weather events and catastrophic flooding.

Why fly in the face of the government edict that houses should **not** be developed on flood plains, which this field most certainly is.

### **Holly Gatrell – Against the application**

I do not believe the suggested improvements will mitigate the flooding which happens periodically in the area and this is a flood plain. I have witnessed this flooding and the road is 1-2ft deep of water all around the Paddock fields at this time of year when it floods.

I have followed all the correspondence regarding this and the developers have not allayed my fears.

### **Patrick & Diana Chick – Against the application**

We were appalled to hear of yet another planning application by Midsomer Homes and the Rushmore Estate for 7 houses to be built on the Frogmore Field.

This has already been turned down 3 or more times as the field is on a floodplain and regularly floods. The government announced only a few months ago that development of floodplain sites is now forbidden.

We live in Manor Farm next to the site and have regularly been flooded right through our own house and farm yard. We are sitting over the head waters of the River Allen.



We are at the bottom of the catchment area from the main Village Street; Dean Lane, which takes all the rain from the surrounding hills and the main spring at Woodyates Manor.

All the water from the A354 / B3081 roundabout all comes down to Red Lane and onto Back Lane and is susceptible to serious flooding.

Back Lane becomes impassable as the water lifts the foundations of the road and several feet of water over it, trapping cars and any vehicles that try to drive through it.

The number of houses in the Parish that flood now is growing with extreme weather conditions. Elderly and disabled people who live in these houses worry and are distressed.

Building more houses on this site will add to their anxiety. Red Lane is so narrow that is difficult to get 2 small cars to pass on it.

The Rushmore Estate already has other sites in the village which do not flood and could be developed.

### **James & Leanne Chick – Against the application**

We are surprised and concerned to hear of yet another planning application being submitted by Midsomer Homes and Rushmore Estate for 7 houses to be built on the Frogmore Field.

We met representatives from Midsomer Homes last at a Parish Council meeting which was well attended by many who live in the village & near the site.

At this meeting we informed both the Midsomer Homes and their structural engineering/flood expert that Frogmore Field is a designated flood area and in the past it has severely flooded many times with most of the field being completely under water for many weeks. The water runs off from the field, breaching the lower banks and flows onto backlane road causing erosion to tarmac, potholes and making the road impassable to cars or pedestrians due to the depth of the water. A unanimous vote at this meeting was to reject the planning proposal. Flooding being one of the main reasons, along with many others. Nothing has changed in this application at the proposed site that would eliminate the risk of severe flooding.

With the government announcement that development of floodplain sites is forbidden, this proposal to build houses, garages, concrete & tarmac on a flood area, should not be allowed.

We live at The Tallut, Manor Farm and our house is down from this site. We already get flood water in our yard and buildings when the spring rise of the River Allen occurs with wet weather.

Since many fields and traditional soak away areas in the lower village have been built upon over recent times, the occurrence of flooding has increased, due to there being far more surface run off and little natural soak away capacity. The Frogmore Field site has acted as one of the last areas adjacent to village houses to absorb some of this rainwater/runoff from further up in the village.

The number of houses in the Parish that flood now is growing with the ever increasing extreme weather conditions, causes distress and damage for those residents who live in these houses nearby. Building more houses on this site will exacerbate their anxiety and add to flood issues.

Red Lane is a single lane narrow road with the only passing area being at the midway point, which is now the proposed entrance/exit to the site. This will cause huge traffic issues for any large commercial or HGV vehicles that use this road to bypass the main village high street, as well as the many cars that regularly use this route.

The Rushmore Estate already has other sites in the village which do not flood and would be more suitable to development.

### **Mr Paul New – Against the application**

I was dismayed and alarmed to find that another revision to the planning application has been submitted for the parcel of land in Sixpenny Handley bounded by Frogmore lane, Back Lane and Red Lane.

I wish to object, in principle, to the granting of any planning permission for this field as it is non-viable and detrimental to the village as a whole and the surrounding inhabitants on the following grounds:-

- This field is subject to flooding during heavy rainfall.
- The field acts as a drainage sump for rain water as it is sited at the bottom of the village. A development on this site would have a catastrophic effect on the adjoining estate known as The Paddocks, causing flooding and exacerbating the current issue in Frogmore Lane despite the proposed 'improvements to drainage' mentioned in the application title. We have all seen the effects of building on land subject to flooding, despite mitigation mentioned in planning applications. Developers should not continue to be allowed to build on inappropriate sites.
- There is a current issue, known to Wessex Water, of capacity with both surface and sewerage drainage. A development on this site would surely prove the last straw causing widespread problems throughout Sixpenny Handley.
- The field is a green field site.
- The development will add to the present flood risk and there appears to be no mitigation of this or any attempt to prevent exacerbating the current flooding situation.
- There is sufficient new building in progress or planned for this village which includes provision for low cost housing.
- A previous planning application (1992) was rejected because of flooding risk. Nothing has changed in the intervening time to the surrounding area and we now suffer more concentrated and heavier rainfall due to climate change. Hence planning permission should be denied as the flooding risk remains or has increased.

- Allowing new building on this site flies in the face of the Government edict that houses should not be built on flood plains, which this field most certainly is.

**David Chick, Chairman of Planning, Sixpenny & Pentridge Parish Council**

My Name is David Chick and I am the current chairman of Planning for our parish council. I am writing to strongly object to the terms to the proposed planning application by Rushmore Estates and Midsummer Homes to site 7 new houses on the site of the field located at the junction of Frogmore Lane and Back Lane in Sixpenny Handley.

I have lived at Manor farm, Sixpenny Handley for 53 years, so have a lot of experience of the groundwater and flooding in this area. As Manor farm lies at the lowest part of the village all the surface run off, flood waters and sewage end up flooding the farm house and our land. This has happened on numerous occasions in the past and causes huge damage and disruption.

With regards to the facts, this application has been submitted several times with minor adjustments and has been rejected each time. Many local people I have spoken to recently, believe this is the wrong location for development due to their knowledge of the groundwater situation over many decades. This Knowledge should not be ignored. This field has always flooded, and been a useful soakaway sump for all the runoff from development in the village.

There are plenty of other areas in the village more suitable for development that have no flood risk attached to them.

Government policy is not to build on areas susceptible to flooding and this field is in a flood risk area. With a changing climate, these flooding issues will occur more frequently.

*On appeal the secretary of state's inspector said: "I have strong doubts that the problem of water backing up and onto the site can be overcome. I have concluded that surface water cannot be disposed of satisfactorily without leading to flooding on the site and elsewhere. I hereby dismiss this appeal"* This planning inspector's report is as valid today as it was in 1992.

The comments "leading to flooding on the site and elsewhere" are very relevant, especially to Manor Farm.

As chair of the Planning committee, I have received a lot of comments and correspondence on this application, all strongly objecting. I also strongly object to the application.

**Cliff Lane, Savills – Agent**

Chair, we welcome the case officer's comprehensive report to you, which recommends this application for approval, subject to conditions. We believe the report tackles all the planning issues in an objective way. Her summary of her findings on the application on her first page, at the foot of page 81, and her conclusion at the top of page 90 deal with matters succinctly.

We won't repeat her positive conclusions on the key issues on page 82, nor her more comprehensive planning assessment, starting on page 87, save to say her assessment and conclusion are both fair and objective.

We do note the Parish Council objects to the application, as well as several local residents. We feel all the matters raised as objections have been well covered in the officer's report.

We would like to elaborate on one fundamental objection, which has been cited against the proposal, that of potential flooding. From the outset, the applicants have done all they can to ensure this issue is dealt with, in respect of the site itself and any areas outside of the site.

Comprehensive technical reports were prepared and shared with the Council and its flood advisors. Whilst the whole of the site is in the applicants' control only approximately half is proposed for the 7 dwellings. A comprehensive surface water drainage scheme is proposed, which holds excess surface water on the site in tanks, for it to be released gradually to avoid any surges. It also ensures surface water does not enter the foul drainage system, which we understand has been a problem in the past in Sixpenny Handley.

In summary, the proposals adequately deal with potential flooding issues on site, whilst ensuring run-offs are no worse than at present, and ensure no surface water enters foul drains.

Picking up a few other issues raised:

- No affordable housing is proposed as the scheme of 7 is under the Council's threshold of 10.
- No external lighting is proposed to respect the AONB location
- Natural England, Wessex Water, Dorset Council Highways do not object to the application.

The case officer is also correct in concluding that:

- The principle of development is acceptable, as the site is within the village settlement boundary.
- The development does not harm the AONB, and the design is acceptable.
- There would be no significant impact on neighbours' amenity.
- Loss of view and value are not planning matters.

Thank you

## **Item 9 – P/FUL/2021/02897 – Land Adjacent to 362 Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall**

### **Mr D Forrest & Miss K Knight – Against the application**

The “Report” mentions the impact on other bungalows in May Grove, but nothing on No.11, our beloved home and garden. It states that the extra drive would be made private for the 5 houses only but with no gate allowed how would it be made private? Any member of the public, driving or walking could enter the site off the A350 main road. Our very necessary important security and privacy would be lost. For us at no.11 this would be a disaster.

The proposed application for an “Access Driveway” on the northern side, would also seriously affect no.11 by introducing regular traffic particularly at rush hour periods early in the morning and in the evening, very intrusive, continuous “SIGHT” of traffic, engine and tyre “NOISE”, exhaust “FUMES”, vehicle headlights shining into our rooms and light pollution from the driveway lighting all along the “80 metres” of the rear of our garden. The far end of our garden (only 15 metres wide) is by the A350 but distant sight and sound etc., of traffic is protected from us by the road being well down in a dip.

All Vehicles entering the first relatively flat 5 metres of the proposed “Access Driveway” with 1 in 12 slope would then be immediately asked to climb a severe hill over the second 5 metres x 5 metre high, 12 in 12 slope leading to the proposed dwelling side. The danger this poses is there to all to see and how (pedestrians would negotiate it, getting up and down with no pathways) we fail to see. A Visit to the site would confirm the unsafe high slope.

This “severe” slope could not be levelled out as the existing sewerage pipe (from the coach house and bungalow in the field) crosses this drive at the top of the slope approximately 2 metres below the surface, into the collection chamber in No 11’s garden. Therefore, not allowing reduction in the excessive climb.

Inclement weather rain & ice etc., on the slope would make it slippery and vehicles could easily slide all along the entire narrow length, down into the A350, not a country lane but a SERIOUSLY “Busy” main road, which is becoming busier all the time.

The current soakaway is insufficient and already floods, this water with no barrier would flow down into the main road, soakaways would seem not be sufficient.

This is an Ecological Danger to people’s lives and it would surely create accidents waiting to happen.

### **Elaine Leney – Against the application**

I totally object to the above Planning Application on the grounds that it is an unnecessary and intrusive development.

It would have a huge impact on my privacy as the houses would be close and so much taller than my bungalow that they would completely overlook my bedroom, lounge and garden. They would also cut out sunlight during the winter months.

The style and finish of the proposed houses are entirely out of keeping with the surrounding dwellings.

The influx of a potential 25+ persons in the population would put additional strain on the local amenities and the extra vehicles associated with such a compact development would create increased gas pollution and noise. This goes against the national policies on 'green living'.

The access and egress to and from the development to the already narrow and bending A350 would create problems and the likelihood of it becoming an accident 'black spot'.

It would completely spoil the rural approach to the village from the south and a view that we all value.

I might add that after talking to the occupants of other properties backing on to the development site, I have discovered there was no prior consultation with any of us from Mr and Mrs Adcook.

### **Mr & Mrs Tansey – Against the application**

**Need:** Charlton Marshall and surrounding area has had much recent development. Planning Support Statement (PSS) has excessive wordage but no fact-based demonstration of "an overriding need" for countryside development outside the settlement boundary to satisfy pre-application response (PAR).

**Density:** PSS states 13 dph as 6 dwellings on 0.45 hectares compared to 15dph surrounding. PAR states area 0.4 hectares, so density is 15dph, same not less. PSS states "The Council stated that the site was suitable for a similar density character" whereas PAR states "density *below* 15dph". A "transition" infers decline in density from 15 to 0 so reasonable expectation is 7.5dph: 3 dwellings.

**Access:** Access by way of the Northern part of the site is the most intrusive location for the residents of May Grove in terms of noise and headlights in the hours of darkness. Southern access would be more considerate and further from the bends in the busy A350.

**Overlooking:** Ground floor windows Plot 1 & 2 and first floor French doors and window Plot 3 overlook May Grove houses. Plot 3 garage needlessly close to no. 19.

**Character:** Design inconsistent with nearby properties. Currently edge of Charlton Marshall is barely seen from main road. 362 Bournemouth Road is well hidden on approach. Only glimpses of May Grove properties. Proposed development is hard view of dwellings and a detriment to village character.

**Precedent:** Changes soft South boundary to hard boundary a step closer to Spetisbury. With development in the North towards Lower Blandford St. Mary we are

perilously close to a combined “Spetisbury Marshall St. Mary” instead of three separate villages with their own character. Villagers resent “merging by stealth” from development of land between villages.

Community Support: PAR states “I would encourage early engagement... discussing your proposals with your neighbours and the Parish Council prior to the submission”. Not done: some neighbours not informed at all and others within a week of the application. No date for submission advised and no attempt to gain feedback. Parish Council was not engaged.

Residential Amenity: Applicants previously allowed neighbours to cross field to railway: a key facility for local access. It would be simple to reserve strips of land to provide access for May Grove houses facing development: giving something back to compensate the loss of view. Given precedent for railway access in recent The Old Orchard development, proposal should include access to facing properties for safe, peaceful, pollution free route to local walks, Blandford and Spetisbury including the school and other amenities. Without such provision the opportunity to continue to access the railway is forever lost.

### **Mr & Mrs Maidment – Against the application**

We object to this application.

In 1960 when Meadow Road Estate was built, it was known a Nursery Estate. The developer was H Hawkins Ltd of Bournemouth. May Grove was part of a field that belonged to The Lodge, 362 Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall in 1960. The owner of the Lodge applied to develop the field but was refused on the grounds that the ‘access’ was far too ‘dangerous’ onto the A350, so half the field was sold to Hawkins Ltd. They built May Grove with access into Meadow Road. The other half of the field behind the Lodge, 362 Bournemouth Road, had to be left as ‘Green Belt’

Between the boundary of Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury, also the footpath. The access was in the same position as it is proposed now and the traffic is now 8 times heavier than was then. There has already been one accident with someone coming out of the Lodge onto the A350. If this plan is approved, there will be three entrances onto the A350 from the Lodge. All the entrances are of single lane design with no indication of two lanes or one way traffic. Also, how would the builders traffic get in and out of the site as the sewer goes across between the Lodge and No.11 May Grove. There is no sewerage in that part of the A350, so how could the access be lowered?

In the late 1970’s planning was again applied for and again refused as the access was too dangerous out onto the A350.

When part 2 of the May Grove development was started in August 1963, the agreement was that no means of access for pedestrians or vehicular access shall be constructed onto the A350. Is the agreement of ‘Green Belt’ land between Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury still in law being Spetisbury has the Glebe ground field next to Charlton Marshall boundary dividing the 2 villages?

Our village wants affordable homes that local people can afford, not big 4 bedroom properties.

### **Charlton Marshall Parish Council**

Charlton Marshall Parish Council unanimously objects to this planning application.

The concerns are as follows:

- This development is unlikely to meet local housing needs as the properties are likely to be unaffordable to residents and their families who want to remain in the village.
- The number of houses and whether the location is sustainable. It is felt that 6 houses is too many for the site, particularly due to the size of the proposed dwellings in relation to the pre-existing adjacent bungalows on May Grove.
- The site is outside of the settlement boundary and would be highly visible from the road and railway, therefore being visually intrusive in the landscape. The development would alter the entrance to the village.?? would extend the village southwards into open countryside, thereby opening up the distinct possibility of future development encroaching onto greenfield land that forms the separation between Charlton Marshall and Spetisbury.
- The hazardous entrance/exit onto the site. 362 has 2 entrances, one being on a 40 mph section of the A350 and the other on a 30 mph. This means that high numbers of vehicles are still travelling at 40 mph when they reach the proposed entrance. The entrances are on the bend of the road with poor visibility inwards and outwards. It should also be noted there is no pavement, making it very hazardous for pedestrians/cyclists emerging at this location, Furthermore, vehicles leaving the driveway would immediately be on the road. The A350 is a very busy road during the hours of 0700 – 1800. Community Speedwatch records numbers of vehicles at approx 600 -1000 an hour, this includes a high number of HGVs. The steep gradient of the driveway raises safety issues particularly when there is water and or ice on the roads. If the initial section of the driveway was to be levelled the issue of the steepness of the remaining driveway is still not dealt with. There are issues around the sewer location and how close to the surface of the driveway it would be if the surface were to be levelled. There is no detail of the intended width of the driveway and if two-way traffic could pass safely.
- Negative impact on neighbouring properties, loss of privacy, increase in light and noise pollution. No detail has been provided over the planned height of these houses!
- This development would be out of keeping with the character of No 362 and the surrounding estate of bungalows.



### **Ken Parke, Ken Parke Planning Consultants – Agent**

The inclusion of this small parcel of land is a logical extension of the settlement boundary. The land is bounded on 2 sides by the existing settlement boundary and by the redundant railway line on the 3rd side. The inclusion of the land results in a logical squaring off, of the village rather than an encroachment into open countryside.

There is thus logic to develop the site despite the housing supply position. The automatic presumption however does apply, and its application, would favour development contiguous to settlements as opposed to within the open countryside away from a settlement.

The settlement is identified as sustainable and the additional modest housing development will assist, support and maintain local services and facilities.

The widened access point into the site is already approved and considered acceptable. The proposed access to the rear will regrade the land so that the correct gradient can be achieved.

The access is safe with adequate visibility and the Highway Officer raises no objection.

The houses are all of individual, traditional appearance and designed utilising appropriate materials.

The density is purposefully low with the houses situated on reasonable sized plots. The Officer's Report confirms that there will be minimal visual impact from the A350 or from the adjoining railway.

The proposals will sit comfortably as a low-density village fringe development.

The dwellings will be visible from adjoining residential properties to the north. The careful design and siting of the dwellings however ensures adequate separation distances with no opportunities for loss of privacy or any other harmful impacts. The proposals step down towards the common boundary. There will be change in outlook however the relationships are not harmful.

This modest, well designed residential development will provide more housing in a logical and appropriate manner relative to the settlement boundary. Development of this site will also assist Members resist development that may place reliance on housing supply, in less appropriate locations either locally or across the district.

Members are respectfully requested to support the Officer's recommendations