

Public Document Pack



EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 5 JANUARY 2022

Present: Cllrs Toni Coombs (Chairman), Shane Bartlett (Vice-Chairman), Mike Barron, Alex Brenton, Robin Cook, Mike Dyer, Barry Goringe, David Morgan, David Tooke and Bill Trite

Apologies: Cllrs Julie Robinson and John Worth

Also present: Cllrs David Walsh and Gary Suttle

238. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Julie Robinson and John Worth.

239. **Declarations of Interest**

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

Cllr Bill Trite declared that as he had been seen to predetermine the application - in respect of minute 242 - in views he had expressed at a Swanage Town Council meeting he would speak as local member but take no part in the vote.

240. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 29 September, 13 October, 27 October and 1 December 2021 were received, noted and confirmed – on a '**minded to**' basis – , so that the Chairman might ratify them, as necessary.

241. **Public Participation**

Representations by the public to the Committee on individual planning applications are detailed below. There were no questions, petitions or deputations received on other items on this occasion.

242. **SEC/2020/0001 - To modify a Planning Obligation for planning permission 6/2018/0493 (Demolish temporary classrooms and outbuildings and convert existing remaining buildings to form 10 dwellings and erect 20 new dwellings with parking and landscaping, removal of existing raised water tank and to remove the requirement for affordable housing at the former St Marys School, Manor Road,**

Swanage, BH19 2BH

The Committee considered application SEC/2020/0001: **to modify a Planning Obligation for planning permission 6/2018/0493** (Demolish temporary classrooms and outbuildings and convert existing remaining buildings to form 10 dwellings and erect 20 new dwellings with parking and landscaping, removal of existing raised water tank and **to remove the requirement for affordable housing** at the former St Marys School, Manor Road, Swanage.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the application were; how these were to be progressed; and what this entailed.

For context, plans and photographs provided an illustration of the location, orientation, dimensions and appearance of the development and of the individual properties access and highway considerations; the characteristics and topography of the site and views into the site and around it; environmental designation considerations; drainage and water management considerations, the means of landscaping, screening the development's setting within that part of Swanage. Critically the reasons why the applicant now considered to be unable to fulfil the originally planning obligations in providing 11 affordable housing elements were emphasised, all of which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary.

The basis for the application was explained by officers in that the applicant did not now consider able to fulfil the original planning obligations – in providing affordable housing on as part of the development - given their assessment of commitments required to deliver the development. Given this, they maintained that the scheme would not be viable should this obligation be retained. Based on the evidence provided by the applicant, this had been corroborated by the District Valuer in their independent assessment of the viability of the scheme.

For members understanding officers set out the particular reason for the application in that:-

“The applicant had applied to remove the S106 legal agreement that required the provision of 11 affordable housing units as part of the development. In this instance, Policy AH of the Purbeck Local Plan allowed for development of 100% open market housing where it could be satisfactorily demonstrated that a scheme with affordable housing was not viable. Therefore, if the viability argument was satisfied, the S106 agreement could be removed without resulting in the approved scheme being contrary to the Development Plan.”

Given all the evidence provided and in taking into consideration the assessment made by the District Valuer, officers were satisfied that the reasons for the removal of this obligation had been met and this formed that basis of their recommendation to Committee.

The Committee were notified of written submissions and officers read these direct to the Committee – being appended to these minutes. Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised,

being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

One of the two Local Ward members, Councillor Bill Trite, spoke as a local member only. He was concerned that the element of affordable housing was being asked to be removed as there was a critical need for this within Swanage. The other local Member, Councillor Gary Suttle, was of this view too.

Formal consultation had seen an objection from Swanage Town Council, and numerous public objections received expressed concern at the removal of the obligation, considering there to be a real need for affordable housing in Swanage.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, were:-

- what assessment had been made on how viable the scheme would be both with and without the affordable housing element
- concern that the applicant was not now being able to fulfil that obligation and why this was the case

Officers addressed the questions raised – and what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable.

From debate, the majority of the Committee had serious misgivings about the removal of the obligation given that in their opinion all the reasons being used to apply for this would have been readily known at the time the application was approved. Despite the evidence provided by the applicant and corroborated by the District Valuer, members were unconvinced at the assessment made that if the affordable housing element obligation was maintained the development would no longer be viable. Members considered that every opportunity should be given to identifying some means that the affordable housing – or a proportion thereof – could be retained and hoped that there could be some means to still achieve this. Some members considered that the original obligation should be maintained, and that not flexibility should be given to this, insisting that the provision of this obligation should be upheld, in so far that Councillor David Tooke proposed and Councillor Alex Brenton seconded that the application being made should be refused. A vote was taken to refuse the application on that basis, but this vote was lost.

A proposal was then made by the Chairman that consideration of the application be deferred to allow further negotiations on the viability of the scheme with the applicant, to include an assessment of land values and building costs. This would give members a better understanding of the grounds for consideration of the application and could well achieve some

means for the obligation to be maintained, at least to some extent, that was in the interests of and to the satisfaction of all. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Robin Cook.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding - as best they were able - of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Toni Coombs and seconded by Councillor Robin Cook, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed – by a majority of 5:4, with one abstention - to be '**minded to**' defer further consideration of the application to allow further negotiations on the viability of the scheme with the applicant, to include an assessment of land values and building costs.

The Head of Planning, having considered the representations and the officer's presentation and having taken into account the views of the committee, made the following decision under delegated authority.

Decision of the Head of Planning: That the application be deferred to allow further negotiations on the viability of the scheme with the applicant, to include an assessment of land values and building costs.

243. **P/LBC/2021/03854 and P/LBC/2021/03855 - Installation of roof mounted solar photovoltaic panels (PV) and associated infrastructure and Listed Building consent - Durlston Castle, Lighthouse Road, Durlston, Swanage**

The Committee considered applications:

- P/LBC/2021/03854 – for the installation of roof mounted solar photovoltaic panels (PV) and associated infrastructure

and

- P/LBC/2021/03855 - for listed building consent

at Durlston Castle, Lighthouse Road, Durlston, Swanage. The two applications were being considered together as each complemented the other.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers showed what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on existing amenity and the character the area - particularly, the Grade II Listed Durlston Castle – situated within a country park - and that it was:-

- within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- within the Purbeck Heritage Coast;
- within the Durlston Castle Historic Landscape Registered Park and Garden (Grade II);
- adjacent to the Durlston National Nature Reserve;

- adjacent to the South Dorset Coast Site of Special Scientific Interest;
- adjacent to the Island of Portland to Studland Cliffs Special Area of Conservation; and
- less than 50 metres from the Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site.

and taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs showed the appearance and design of the installation and its dimensions; its setting in conjunction with Durlston Castle and within that part of the Durlston site and - in taking into account the environmental and ecological sensitives of the site - the installations relationship with the characteristics of the other assets in and around Durlston Country Park. Views of how it would look and where it would be situated from around the site were shown.

In taking into account those considerations, officers considered the installation would be largely discreet and unobtrusive and would not detract from the important characteristics of the site.

The basis of the application was designed to achieve carbon savings associated with the installation of proposed solar panels and associated infrastructure which would make a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions. Associated cost savings would be to the benefit of the continued use of an important historic building for appropriate and publicly beneficial purposes. On site electricity generation would also make a minor contribution to energy security.

However, on the basis of comments from the Council's Conservation & Design Officer, a modification had been made to the amount of panels and where they were to be situated so that none now were being proposed for installation on the Castle itself and, where they were proposed, there would be fewer of them. Whilst this would reduce their ability to generate the energy originally envisaged, they would still significantly contribute towards green energy generation and their installation was still considered to be viable.

In summary, the officer's assessment considered that as the Development Plan was supportive of the sustainable use and generation of energy where adverse social and environmental impacts had been minimised to an acceptable level, this could be seen as a good illustration of what could be achieved on a Council owned asset.

Formal consultation had seen no objection from Swanage Town Council and the two Ward members, Councillors Gary Suttle and Bill Trite, were supportive.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so

as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision. Officers addressed the questions raised – and what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers.

In understanding how the officer's assessment had been made, the Committee considered that the proposal would make a contribution towards achieving reduced carbon emissions, by the utilisation of a natural resource in providing both an environmental and economic benefit to Dorset and in supporting Dorset Council's case for doing what they could to achieve this.

On that basis and having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of this; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor Bill Trite, in being put to the vote it was agreed, unanimously – on a 'minded to' basis - that the application should be approved.

The Head of Planning, having considered the representations and the officer's presentation and having taken into account the views of the committee, made the following decision under delegated authority.

Decision of the Head of Planning: That the application be approved on the basis of the report and presentation and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Sections 17 of both reports, respectively.

244. **3/21/0668/FUL - To extend the existing single storey building and change use to that of hand car wash facility at land at rear of 5 High Street (High Street Car Park) Wimborne Minster BH21 1HR**

The Committee considered application 3/21/0668/FUL, designed to extend the existing single storey building and change use to that of hand car wash facility at land at rear of 5 High Street (High Street Car Park) Wimborne Minster. The town did not currently have such a car wash within its vicinity.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers provided context of what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on local amenity and the character the area, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs provided an illustration of the location, orientation, dimensions and appearance of the facility; access and highway arrangements; what screening there would be and the development's setting within that part of Wimborne Minster town centre.

Officers showed the development's relationship with other adjacent development in the town centre – that lay within the Conservation Area of Wimborne and Colehill. High Street Car Park - in which the facility would be sited - was located to the rear of the eastern side of Wimborne High Street, being

accessed by a narrow lane which passed between No 5 and No 7 High Street. Views into the site and around the site was shown, which provided a satisfactory understanding of all that was necessary. Four parking spaces would be lost as a result of the proposal.

In summary, the officer's assessment considered the acceptability of the proposal in relation to the Development Plan on the basis that:-

- on balance the principle of the development is considered to be in accordance with saved policy WIMCO23 which provides that the High Street Car Park shall be used for car parking.
- The proposed hand car wash will not have a significant impact on Highway Safety.
- The proposal will not harm the historic significance of Wimborne Conservation Area.
- The proposal will not cause significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring development in terms of noise and disturbance.
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application

For these reasons the proposed development was considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the development plan and so this formed the basis of the recommendation being made by officers to approve the application.

The Committee were notified of written submissions and officers read these direct to the Committee – being appended to these minutes. Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

Formal consultation had seen no objection in principle from Wimborne Minster Town Council although some concerns remained about access issues and, particularly, that Dorset Council Highways had raised no objection to the proposal

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision.

Some important points raised, some of which they considered still required clarification, were:-

- how access arrangements and traffic flows would be managed and what effect there would be on the highway network, the car park and the access lane itself and how this had been assessed
- how surface water and drainage issues would be satisfactorily managed, particularly as the site was in close proximity to the River Allen
- how the constraints of the site could be managed and how manoeuvring of vehicles could be satisfactorily managed to ensure that congestion was kept to a minimum or, ideally, avoided altogether.
- what considerations had been given to the effect this would have on the Wimborne Conservation Area.

Officers addressed the questions raised – and what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers, which the Committee understood to be, and saw, as generally acceptable.

Of importance was that officers considered that the assessment made by the Highways Officer that the highway and traffic management issues could be successfully accommodated as part of the development should be reassuring to Members and that, to improve access arrangements, provision would be made to install a mirror to assist motorists at the ‘dog-leg’ approach to the facility to better anticipate incoming and outgoing vehicles.

Officers were confident that regarding those issues and concerns raised by Members, the application of the conditions and informative notes to any grant of permission would satisfactorily address all of those issues.

One of the two local ward Members, Councillor Shane Bartlett, considered that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the conservation area and its appearance. Along with the concerns about access and site constraints, he felt unable to support the application.

From debate, the majority of the Committee considered that what was being proposed was contrived and expressed concern at the access arrangements, considering these to be inadequate for what was necessary to be able to operate the facility satisfactorily. Concern was also raised that the constraints of the site would not provide for the necessary safe or practical manoeuvring of vehicles that would be required to access the facility, with the probability of significant congestion from queuing and manoeuvring vehicles at that point. Members also felt that those arrangements could seriously compromise safety of pedestrians, given that the car park was a well-used pedestrian route across town. On that basis, whilst they saw the benefits of such a facility within the town, they considered the proposal, as it stood, to be unacceptable.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having taken into account the officer’s report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Shane Bartlett and seconded by Councillor Robin Cook, on being put to the vote, the Committee agreed unanimously - by 9:0 - to be **minded to refuse** permission.

The Head of Planning, having considered the representations and the officer’s presentation and having taken into account the views of the committee, made the following decision under delegated authority.

That the application be **refused** for the following reasons:-

- The site is too constrained for the proposed development to function well and without conflict with the existing use of the site as a car park. As a consequence the development would fail to function well or add to the overall quality of the area contrary to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

- The proposal would lead to the loss of parking spaces contrary to saved policy WIMCO23 of the East Dorset Local Plan 2002.
- The proposal fails to demonstrate that it would not lead to a significant increase in vehicular traffic entering the site, increasing the risk to the safety of vehicles and pedestrians passing through the site and past the junction of the site access with the High Street. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy KS11 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan 2014.
- The vehicle exit from the proposed car wash building would appear as an industrial and utilitarian construction in views from the High Street causing harm to the historic setting and significance of the Conservation Area and adjacent Listed Buildings. As such the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets that is not outweighed by a public benefit contrary to paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

245. P/HOU/2021/02711 - Construction of replacement porch at 1 Hillside Affpuddle Dorset DT2 7HQ

The Committee considered application P/HOU/2021/02711 for the construction of replacement porch at 1 Hillside, Affpuddle, Dorset.

With the aid of a visual presentation, and taking account the detail in the report, officers showed what the main proposals, principles and planning issues of the development were. The presentation focused on not only what the development entailed and its detailed design, but what effect it would have on residential amenity and the character the area, taking into account the policies against which this application was being assessed.

Plans and photographs showed the appearance of the development and its dimensions; its setting within that part of Affpuddle and the development's relationship with other adjacent residential development and their characteristics.

The officer's assessment was based on the provisions of Para 11d of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and, particularly, on the view of the Conservation Officer in that, whilst there was no objection to the principle of a replacement porch, the proposed design had a dominating affect due to its increased height, width, solidity and roof form which was considered to cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Piddle Valley Conservation Area.

In summary, the officer's assessment considered that the proposed porch - due to its size, design and visually prominent position - failed to positively

integrate with its surroundings and was contrary to the statutory requirement to pay special attention to preserving or enhancing Conservation Areas, resulting in less than substantial harm to the heritage asset which was not outweighed by any public benefit.

The Committee were notified of written submissions and officers read these direct to the Committee – being appended to these minutes. Having heard what was said, officers responded to some of the pertinent issues raised, being confident that each one could be addressed by the provisions of the application.

Formal consultation had seen support for the application from Affpuddle Parish Council and one of the two Ward members, Councillor Peter Wharf.

The opportunity was then given for members to ask questions of the presentation and what they had heard, in seeking clarification of aspects so as to have a better understanding in coming to a decision. Officers addressed the questions raised – and what clarification was needed - providing what they considered to be satisfactory answers.

Whilst understanding how the officer's assessment had been made, the Committee did not consider that the application would cause less than substantial harm. Indeed, they considered that there would be no harm as it could be seen as an enhancement to the street scene and would be a considerable improvement on what was currently there. Moreover, both Affpuddle Parish Council and one of the two local members supported it too. Members asked that, if at all practicable, the porch's appearance be as complementary as it could be with that of its semi-detached neighbour and that appropriate glazing be considered, as necessary.

On that basis and having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of this; having taken into account the officer's report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, in being proposed by Councillor Alex Brenton and seconded by Councillor Shane Bartlett, in being put to the vote it was agreed, unanimously – on a 'minded to' basis - that the application should be approved.

The Head of Planning, having considered the representations and the officer's presentation and having taken into account the views of the committee, made the following decision under delegated authority.

Decision of the Head of Planning: That the application be approved on the basis that it was adjudged that the proposed front extension would improve the visual appearance of the existing dwelling which was sited within a row of modern dwellings with varying form. The proposal was modest development within the countryside in accordance with policy CO and its impact within the streetscene would be limited by its position set back from the highway and screening by intervening boundary enclosure and vegetation. The proposal did not impact on the setting of River Cottage, a Grade II listed building and was not found to result in harm to the Conservation Area. It was therefore

judged to accord with policies D and LHH of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1, Chapter 16 of the NPPF and the statutory requirement of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

246. **Urgent items**

There were no items of business considered by the Chairman as urgent.

247. **Written Representations**

SEC/2020/0001 - TO MODIFY A PLANNING OBLIGATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION 6/2018/0493 (DEMOLISH TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS AND OUTBUILDINGS AND CONVERT EXISTING REMAINING BUILDINGS TO FORM 10 DWELLINGS AND ERECT 20 NEW DWELLINGS WITH PARKING AND LANDSCAPING, REMOVAL OF EXISTING RAISED WATER TANK AND TO REMOVE THE REQUIREMENT FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT THE FORMER ST MARYS SCHOOL, MANOR ROAD, SWANAGE,

Jenny Hounsell

I'm dismayed to hear that the developers of the site of the former St Mary's School, Manor Road, Swanage are asking to remove the requirement for affordable housing from their plans. I do not think Swanage needs another 30 houses/flats that local families cannot afford to live in. I would therefore like to register my objection to the amendment to the plans.

Paul Angel

I am writing to object to the application by Bracken Developments Ltd to remove the requirement for affordable housing on the site of the former St Mary's School in Swanage.

The developer knew what they were taking on, a difficult site in the town centre, and they always intended to renege on the requirement to include affordable housing within the development. If they genuinely believed that the development wasn't economically viable they wouldn't have proposed development in the first place. The figures shown in their Economic Viability Assessment demonstrate a loss based on 2019 property values. While the cost of build will inevitably have risen, house valuations in Swanage have far outstripped inflation and it is likely that they would now see a fair profit if the market-value houses are sold at 2021 prices.

Please don't let them get away with this. Swanage does not need a high-density development in this location and the only mitigating factor for the town is that there may be some homes that are affordable for local families.

Becky Stares

I understand that the developer of the former St Mary's School site in Swanage has applied to reduce/remove affordable housing from this site. There is a huge need for affordable housing in Swanage, with so many second homes and people from elsewhere moving in and driving up housing prices.

As a person who was born and bred in Swanage, the only way I have been able to afford to continue living here is to live with my parents in the house where I grew up - something I did not envisage doing at the age of 44. Although I work in a professional job, as a single adult with a child I am not able to afford to buy even a one-bedroomed flat. In my opinion, affordable housing schemes are absolutely essential, to give local people to chance to stay in the area.

I therefore strongly urge you to reject the developer's request.

.....

Richard and Liz Moremon

We wish to OBJECT to the modification of this planning application to remove the requirement for affordable housing for this development.

As a resident of the town, with a daughter who has recently benefited from a similar scheme locally, we think this is an abject dereliction of duty by the Council if they agree to remove this provision.

I hope this objection is registered at the next meeting to discuss this request, and that the developer is told to revert to their original plans.

Philippa Coates

Please would you register my strong objection to the alteration of the above planning application to remove the requirement for an allocation of affordable homes.

Swanage is struggling to house the local people upon whom it relies to provide shops and other services. It is vital to the survival of the town that these people can be offered affordable housing. There are too many second homes in the town along with people who have moved here often retired, and can afford expensive properties.

This development needs to have the allocated affordable homes.

Martin Grimsdale

I have just been made aware that the above planning application has been modified to request the removal of the provision of affordable housing. This is completely unacceptable. As you will no doubt be aware Swanage has a large population of young families and their children, supporting three primary schools. There is a very clear and obvious need for affordable housing if Swanage is to retain and maintain its heritage through our young and developing population. The current economic climate is difficult enough for young families without reducing their limited opportunities to remain in the area.

I strongly object to this application and hope that you make the right decision.

Chris Bond

I would like to register my objection to the revision of the planning for St Mary's Road.

When I saw the original application, a major benefit was the percentage of affordable homes making up the development. On this basis I was happy not to raise any objections.

Now the developers want to remove/reduce this.

Swanage DOES need new houses, but these should be prioritised for locals and their families. Removing the affordable element effectively means more of these houses will end up second homes/AIR BNB etc. I'm sure this goes against the original intention of use from when it was a convent and then subsequently a school.

Also in general, I do not understand why developers are allowed to get away with this cynical ploy. Initial application has affordable housing included, then over time this commitment is watered down as supplementary applications . I would hope that Dorset Council have sufficient principles to stand against this sinister practise.

I strongly object to the revision of terms – please ensure this is recorded against the application.

Julian Morley

I am writing to object to the modification SEC/2020/0001 of the Planning Application 6/2018/0493, site of the former St Mary's School, Manor Road, Swanage. The modification SEC/2020/0001 is for the removal of the existing requirement for affordable housing and I ask that the modification be refused.

A corporate priority of Purbeck District Council is to meet local housing needs and evidence shows that affordable housing can be provided as part of some developments, whilst still remaining financially viable (source "Calculating affordable housing (AH) planning obligations in Purbeck"). Policy AH requires that any schemes for new residential development over two dwellings must provide a proportion as affordable housing. The number of new dwellings in the development is 20, so based on [How to calculate the contribution for affordable housing as part of a planning application](#) the number of affordable homes should be 10, based on the 50% rule.

Nicola Brown

Please register my objection to the above planning application based on the modification not to include affordable housing.

As far as I am aware the Purbeck planning guidelines state that any 50% of new homes at any site must be affordable which is clearly not the case with the above modification.

Please confirm that my objection has been registered.

Jason Elford

In regards to the above planning application I am writing due to being very concerned about its modification on the subject of the removal of the provision of affordable housing.

I feel for various reasons this amendment should not be agreed. Furthermore the stipulation for the provision of affordable housing be re-instated and no planning for this site be considered or sanctioned without it in place for this or any future proposal. Swanage has a large population of young families and their children whom should be rightly considered in regards to future developments in the areas they are born and live. Removing the option of affordable housing simply discriminates against local people requiring the opportunity/need of the provision. It forces them to leave the area and in many cases move away from other family members who they either support or are supported by. The removal of the provision of affordable housing to maximise profits over local interest should not be the way our local authorities proceed in such matters. The requirements of those in need

whom are part of our community should be the first consideration and should be protected. As such I STRONGLY OBJECT to the amendments.

Maria Green

In regards to the above planning application I am writing due to being very concerned about its modification on the subject of the removal of the provision of affordable housing.

I feel for various reasons this amendment should not be agreed. Furthermore the stipulation for the provision of affordable housing be re-instated and no planning for this site be considered or sanctioned without it in place for this or any future proposal.

Swanage has a large population of young families and their children whom should be rightly considered in regards to future developments in the areas they are born and live.

Removing the option of affordable housing simply discriminates against local people requiring the opportunity/need of the provision. It forces them to leave the area and in many cases move away from other family members who they either support or are supported by.

The removal of the provision of affordable housing to maximise profits over local interest should not be the way our local authorities proceed in such matters. The requirements of those in need whom are part of our community should be the first consideration and should be protected; not blindsided by amendments being seemingly 'snuck' through over the busy festive period. Again, I VERY STRONGLY OBJECT to the amendments and am hopeful that the correct decision will be made regarding this.

Silena E Calvo

It has come to mine and many others notice that the above planning application has been modified to request the removal of the provision of affordable housing.

This is totally unacceptable, with the amount of young families and couples that are already struggling to find affordable homes and they are being pushed further and further out of Swanage.

In years to come for Swanage to still be "on the map" we need to support our local young people to live and work here and to do that there needs to be properly priced affordable housing. We have no need for more hugely inflated priced homes that generally fall into the hands of 2nd home owners as they are the only ones that can afford them.

I strongly object to this application and am greatly disappointed that this development is trying to use the Christmas period to "sneak" in this request in the hope that we are all too busy with our Christmas plans and what to do about Omicron, shameful!

This would be depriving the area of what is much needed affordable housing, (which by the way still leaves much to be desired as affordable, affordable should be based on the average wage of those living and working in the area and be realistic).

So, you hereby receive my total objection to the removal of affordable housing within the plan .

Daniel Calvo-Westcott

It has come to mine and many others notice that the above planning application has been modified to request the removal of the provision of affordable housing.

This is totally unacceptable, with the amount of young families and couples that are already struggling to find affordable homes and they are being pushed further and further out of Swanage.

In years to come for Swanage to still be “on the map” we need to support our local young people to live and work here and to do that there needs to be properly priced affordable housing. We have no need for more hugely inflated priced homes that generally fall into the hands of 2nd home owners as they are the only ones that can afford them.

I strongly object to this application and am greatly disappointed that this development is trying to use the Christmas period to “sneak” in this request in the hope that we are all too busy with our Christmas plans and what to do about Omicron, shameful!

This would be depriving the area of what is much needed affordable housing, (which by the way still leaves much to be desired as affordable, affordable should be based on the average wage of those living and working in the area and be realistic).

So, you hereby receive my total objection to the removal of affordable housing within the plan

.....

Beth Roberts-Miller

I am writing regarding the above development (of the old St Mary’s School grounds) and the recent application to remove the requirement for affordable housing.

I feel it is necessary to point out a few things regarding this application...

1. It is, of course, categorically reprehensible to attempt to bypass the provision of affording housing in this development, much needed in the area. Property prices are rising steadily and many locals are being priced out of Purbeck by the wealthy (or second homers, whose absence kills the town, the community and its services).

2. It is, also, categorically reprehensible to make this application precisely now, when most people are trying to enjoy the holiday season, especially since last year's Christmas was so heavily restricted.

It smacks of a developer with no moral code. Just the sort of developer who would promise to gift land to the council if his building application went through and then, as soon as it went through, decide not to gift that land after all.

There are already a great many concerns about the development - safeguarding the children of St Mary's School first and foremost (in terms of privacy, air quality AND road safety). I have made my views clear on this before but may I reiterate that Swanage medical practice is wholly overrun and it takes weeks and weeks for an appointment. I have had to wait nearly a year for treatment on my hand, which stopped me from being able to work. I knew Covid has a lot to answer for, but the people of Swanage are under threat. There are threats to take the ambulance car away. The dentists are full, the surgery is bursting its capacity. The locals are working very hard to keep this community together and to keep this community safe. What we don't need is a greedy developer hoodwinking the council and the locals. And we certainly don't need a council to look the other way.

Allowing this developer to profit so substantially from the town without giving anything back, would be a very erroneous move indeed. It would destroy the goodwill of the whole town.

As a parent of a child at St Mary's, I hear an awful lot of opinions of those who will be directly affected by this development. We all agree the town needs housing - but for locals to be able to benefit, there must be affordable housing. It is as simple as that. We also all agree that Northbrook Road is a disaster waiting to happen - traffic is only getting worse. Parking for the school is hazardous, the pavements are too narrow. Children of all ages, scooters, buggies, parents, go up and down that pavement twice a day and always have to walk in the road to pass one another. We also all agree that it is unacceptable to have houses and gardens overlooking our children's play fields, with no visual barrier provided such as tall trees or shrubs. I could go on...

I am begging you to consider extremely carefully the choices made regarding this development, and of course to dismiss outright the application to remove the requirement for affordable housing. Please do not be complicit with this underhand and Machiavellian application.

.....

Barrie Friend

I am writing to object to the developer's attempt to modify the planning application at the site of the former St Mary's School, Manor Road, Swanage.

Swanage needs affordable housing and the developer was granted planning permission to develop the site which included affordable housing within the 30 planned properties.

He is now attempting to evade, ?again, providing this affordable housing by modifying the plans. Planning permission was given because of the affordable housing clause and it should remain as such.

Call me old fashioned and cynical but his making this amendment just before the Christmas and New Year period of festivities when most people would not see the amendment or be too busy to object is very suspicious as the planning meeting considering the amendment is on 5th January and the objections would need effectively to be received by you on 3rd January.

We need affordable housing in Swanage. Please do not allow the amendment to be approved. Thank you.

.....

Veronica Fraser

Affordable housing equals **significant economic impacts**, including increases in local purchasing power, job creation etc. Please continue to require developers to include affordable housing in the schemes they put forward.

.....

Clare Nonhebel

I'm appalled to learn that an application has been put forward to evade the need to provide affordable housing, by the developers of the site of the former St Mary's School, Manor Road, Swanage.

Local families seriously need provision made for affordable housing - both house prices and rentals are extremely high and out of reach of many working people.

Please take this comment into account, together with the general feeling of local Swanage people - many of whom will not have heard about this, as the application has gone in just before Christmas and many families are also affected by Covid.

.....

Dan Goode

I am writing register my objection to the modification of the subject planning application to remove the provision for affordable housing.

Firstly I think I can be forgiven for thinking that attempting to modify the application while many people are pre-occupied with another Covid Christmas is quite crafty.

Swanage has a large population of young families and their children whom should be rightly considered in regards to future developments in the areas they are born and live. Removing the option of affordable housing simply discriminates against local people requiring the opportunity/need of the provision. It forces them to leave the area and in many cases move away from other family members who they either support or are supported by.

The removal of the provision of affordable housing to maximise profits over local interest should not be the way our local authorities proceed in such matters. The requirements of those in need whom are part of our community should be the first consideration and should be protected.

There is already a large number of second homes and holiday lets in the town and it's most obvious during out of season months. Entire streets are in darkness leaving little room for any town community of the kind that will provide for those that stay in these properties.

For these reasons, this amendment should not be agreed. Furthermore the stipulation for the provision of affordable housing should be re-instated and no planning for this site be considered or sanctioned without it in place for this or any future proposal.

.....

Rowland Hughes

Please include my objection to the Modification of Planning Application SEC/2020/0001 - To "REMOVE THE REQUIREMENT FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING".

This is in direct contravention of why planning permission was granted to the applicants in the first place. I ask DDC to see that this is a very cynically timed move on behalf of the applicants to subvert the planning procedure so that they can further their own ends.

.....

Melanie Field

I wish to appeal against the latest modification of the above plans with regards to the removal of the requirement for affordable housing element.

We definitely need to have more housing available for the locals at local prices so we need to keep the requirement of affordable housing on all plans.

The current house prices are just ridiculously high and there is no possibility of locals being able to buy with a salary of less than £50k and with a £50k deposit.

Also I wish to suggest that with the other houses which would go on the open market. (Not just this plan but all future housing and hopefully applied retrospectively). That there should be a clause: That the housing needs to be OCCUPIED all the time as a main residence. (Either owners or renters). With checks in place to make sure. As I know alot of properties in Swanage have just one person supposedly living here for council tax purposes, so not classed as second homes, but the houses are actually empty for the majority of the year.

(A separate future project for the council to qualify these empty homes and tax them more! As my estimates are 1 in 5 houses and over 50% flats in Swanage fall into this category or even worse, classed as small business (Airbnb and other rental) and not paying any council tax at all. Bearing in mind that there are approx 4000 residences in Swanage, you should get 2000 to pay up more council tax.)

I trust that the council will not allow the affordable housing requirement to be dropped off the above plan and future ones, otherwise the whole area will just become a ghost town as the younger generations have been priced out and moved out of area. Especially as there is hardly any new social housing being built to replace the old social housing being sold without a local covenant on! Also it is almost impossible to actually be eligible to go on the social housing waiting list in the first place.

Ask yourself with 1000 on the original social housing waiting list before new criteria was imposed and reduced the list accordingly, we could have easily rehomed them in the existing 2000 empty houses if local rules permitted it. Therefore it would save building alot of very small footprint houses and titchy gardens. (Current policy is to maximise £'s to quality of life in a bigger roomed house and gardens).

Ms C Frohwein

I am writing to say that I STRONGLY OBJECT to the application to modify the planning obligation for Planning Permission 6/2018/0493 in order to remove the requirement for affordable housing.

I support the development of this disused site of the former St Mary's School on Manor Rd, for much-needed housing in this area, however I am appalled that the developer is applying to evade providing affordable housing which is desperately needed in Swanage.

It would be a travesty if this application were to be approved and it would set a precedent for other developers in the area to avoid providing affordable housing. Affordable housing should be a priority for Dorset Council, especially somewhere like Swanage which is awash with empty second homes/holiday rentals, while the local population is priced out of the market.

I therefore ask that you REFUSE the above application.

.....

Chris Bradey (Chair)/ Peter Jacobs - Swanage and Rural Purbeck Labour Party

The Swanage and Rural Purbeck Branch of the Labour Party have been made aware that Bracken Developments Ltd have applied to modify the Planning Obligation for planning permission 6/2018/0493. They are seeking to remove the obligation in the section 106 legal agreement to provide 11 affordable housing units. This comes before the Planning Committee on 5 January 2022.

The Developer has repeatedly attempted to modify the approval since it was originally provisionally granted in 2018. The material circumstances around the development site have not significantly changed despite the developer claiming that a series of abnormal costs have “come to light” since the original grant of approval. These “abnormal” costs include some demolition and clearance of existing buildings and site features, construction of a retaining wall to deal with site topography and an attenuation tank to deal with surface water drainage management. It is hard to see how these issues have only come to light now and were not apparent in the original extensive planning application.

What is self evident is that local property prices have increased substantially over the period and a competent developer will make significant profits when selling in a market even more favourable than that in 2018.

Another self evident truth is that Swanage is in desperate need of more Affordable Housing. The best data available suggests that local residents waiting to be housed in Purbeck, in a 2 bedroom dwelling, have to wait between 14 months and 29 years to reach the top of the list. The Swanage & Rural Purbeck Labour Party will continue to campaign on this issue and wish to record our strong opposition to Bracken’s attempt to develop the site without Affordable Housing.

.....

Linda Baker

I object to the developers request that the commitment to included affordable homes in the above application be removed. The circumstances have not changed since the original planning application was submitted so they should have been fully aware of their costs and profit margins.

.....

Karen Foster

I am writing this email to express my objections to modify the existing planning application to drop the affordable housing.

Swanage desperately needs affordable housing for the town to grow and to keep families in the area, if this was dropped most of the properties would become second homes which will kill the lovely community of Swanage, you only have to look at Worth Matravers.

I feel it is about time builders apply for building plans with all these promises of affordable homes, shared ownership or converting an existing property then once the plans have been granted they then try to modify them. They should be made to do these buildings first and then they cannot get out of it.

Please please turn this down let's keep Swanage the special place it is by having affordable homes that families can afford to buy to become part of this amazing community and for the town to grow.

.....

Cllrs. Debbie Monkhouse (Lab) and Nicola Rogers (Con) - Swanage Town Council

The affordable housing requirement should not be removed because:

1. Swanage needs affordable homes to remain a thriving community.
2. "Abnormal costs" were largely known at first planning application.
3. The Chairman of Swanage Community Land Trust (CLT) would like to explore the possibility of a no loss option for the developer in favour of 100% social housing where the affordable housing would have been.

1. Affordable Homes

In 2020 DC reported over 150 households waiting for Swanage, with a wait of up to 29 years for a 2-bed property in Purbeck. Local people rely on DC to represent them, and will see the Officer's recommendation as putting developers' profit above a roof over their heads.

The DC Swanage Housing Needs Survey (2016) said the majority in housing need reported an income below £26,000 pa. Families can't afford to buy, and private rented housing is unaffordable and insecure. 8% of the 1,000 respondents reported family members having to move out of Swanage because of housing costs here.

In 2019 17% of Swanage dwellings were second homes, but this figure excluded those not claiming second home council tax discount, and holiday lets. The real figure today is closer to 25% non-primary residences. We need affordable housing to halt the hollowing out of our community.

2. "Abnormal Costs:"

We respect the DVS, however do not understand some figures allowed.

- The Water Tower was demolished by 2 men in 5 days with one low loader and light scaffolding (allowed cost £25,000 (15.6)).
- Can off-site heritage costs, agreed at first application, be 'abnormal'? (15.7).
- Why were costs not factored in for retaining walls for a site on a slope? (15.6).
- Can premiums for the landowner/third party landowner, known at first application, be justification for AH removal?

House prices continue to rise. The pandemic increased demand in Purbeck, as more home working enabled people to move out of virus-ridden cities. What current house prices figures are being used? (15.17)

The Purbeck local plan is likely to be finalised shortly, giving H11 Affordable Housing, and H14 Second Homes, full weight, calling into question the timing of this application.

That increased CIL costs from selling the houses at 100% open market value can be accommodated confirms they will be out of reach of local people.

3. Another Option – Robin Sutcliffe, the Chairman of SCH, would very much welcome the possibility of looking at the feasibility of making the affordable homes portion of the site available for the beautiful, green and practical social housing Swanage desperately needs, with the developer suitably recompensed.

Please investigate before a decision is made .

.....

Barry Cullimore

I have lived in Swanage for 26 years and my two sons went to school locally but have now moved away from Purbeck, partly due to the lack of affordable housing in the area.

I feel it is essential that Dorset Council does all it can to ensure developers meet the requirements for affordable housing and hope that you see fit to refuse any modifications by this particular property developer in this instance.

.....

Peter Bowyer - Chair the Purbeck Society

The Purbeck Society objects to the proposal to remove the provisions for affordable housing from the development of the site of the former St.Marys school in Swanage ref SEC/2020/0001.

The Economic Viability Assessment does not appear to present a full and up to date picture.

First, the site was purchased by Bracken at the time of the Economic Viability Assessment. The purchaser should have been aware of the planning conditions for the provision of affordable housing.

Second, the Economic Viability Assessment has not valued the increase in house prices since the date of writing the report. www.home.co.uk quotes a rise of 30% in the prices of detached houses in Dorset over the period November 2019 to September 2021.

Third, even though the expected profit is c 17.5% this is a high return. The increases in house prices since November 2019 are significant and enhance the opportunity for the developer to sell market housing thereby increasing this % return. Greater success and effort by the developer to sell the market housing would enable the developer to comply with the condition to provide the required affordable housing.

Relying on a dated Economic Viability Assessment undermines public confidence in the planning service and appears to distort the applicant's case for the requested amendment to this application.

The Purbeck Society strongly opposes this proposal.

.....

Nicola Clark, Clerk to Swanage Town Council

The Town Council would wish to express its complete disappointment and frustration that the developer has submitted an application to remove the requirement for affordable housing so soon after obtaining planning approval for this development, the decision on which could have a material adverse impact on local housing needs/requirements. Further comments are made as follows:

- In accordance with Policy AH – Affordable Housing of the Purbeck

Local Plan, the development is required to make a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing.

- Pre-application advice (x2) had been taken by the developer regarding

this development, which included details/advice regarding the affordable housing policy and guidelines, and attention is also drawn to the Senior Housing Officer's Report (8/11/2018) and email dated 10/01/2019.

- Members have reviewed the developer's Economic Viability

Assessment dated 26th November 2019, which has been completed

less than eight months after planning permission had been granted (on 2nd April 2019). Questions are raised regarding the reliability of the values and valuations contained therein, and comments are made that house prices in the local area have not materially changed since that time. It is further felt that these financial projections should not overturn/be a valid reason to go against the Council's Affordable Housing Policy.

The Town Council therefore wishes to make it clear that it deplores any move to withdraw the affordable housing element of this development scheme.

.....

Jo Tasker – Ken Parke Planning Consultants – on behalf of the applicant

Thank you for this opportunity to make a representation to you.
I am speaking on behalf of the applicants to support the application.

After very careful consideration we found that unfortunately this application was needed because the current scheme is found to be unviable.

We submitted this application in May 2020. The applicants took specialist advice from engineers, quantity surveyors and a valuation consultant. Expert advice underpins a detailed Economic Viability Assessment prepared by Mr Newman who is a Chartered Surveyor and Registered RICS Valuer. We paid the Council's fees for independent consideration of Mr Newman's assessment by the Government's Valuation Office Agency (District Valuation Service, known as DVS).

Supplementary information and clarification was required during the process and we provided this and paid an additional fee to the DVS for their further consideration.

This very thorough assessment process has taken more than 18 months.

The DVS has agreed that the development is not viable if affordable housing is provided. This is set out in detail in your officer's report to committee, a recommendation made following a lengthy and detailed technical assessment by experts.

The applicants reasonably and respectfully request that Members support their Officer's recommendation and allow the removal of the Section 106 legal agreement in this case.

3/21/0668/FUL - TO EXTEND THE EXISTING SINGLE STOREY BUILDING AND CHANGE USE TO THAT OF HAND CAR WASH FACILITY AT LAND AT REAR OF 5 HIGH STREET (HIGH STREET CAR PARK) WIMBORNE MINSTER

.....

John Gatrell (on behalf of Wimborne Residents Action Group)

As a resident of the town and representative of the Wimborne Residents Action Group, I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds.

1. We believe the proposal site is within the Wimborne Minster Conservation area and is adjacent to listed buildings yet no Heritage Statement has been provided.
2. The proposal is within the Primary Shopping Area as defined by policy WMC1. We do not believe the use can be classified as retail.
3. Policy WMC1 states *“The Townscape quality of the town centre will be enhanced; only high quality development proposals that respect and enhance the local character of the centre... will be permitted”*. The proposal neither respects nor enhances the area.
4. Policy WMC1 states *“..in order to improve pedestrian safety, traffic movement and improve the ambience of the public realm, traffic management and calming measures will be considered to reduce pedestrian/vehicular conflict and enhancements to the High Street will be introduced...”* The proposal requires vehicular access across a busy pavement and narrow passageway and runs directly contrary to this policy.
5. Policy WMC1 states *“New development...in the town centre will be of the highest standard of design...to reflect the architectural and historic significance of the town centre.”* The proposed design is not of high quality nor in keeping with the town centre. This requirement is also reinforced by policy HE2.
6. The noise impact on neighbouring residential properties will be considerable. The submitted sound report notes the proposal will require mitigation because of the noise generated, but these measures may not be employed and in any case are likely to be ineffective in containing low frequency noise. A number of premises in the town already flout various regulations regarding licenses (such as A-boards). It should also be noted that most of the surrounding residences are Grade II listed and therefore will not be permitted to make changes to their properties to mitigate the noise that this development will generate daily. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to Policy DES2.
7. As the proposal requires an oil interceptor (as noted in the Vehicle Waste Water Recycling System document), we would expect there to be details of the drainage system. The proposal will generate oil and other pollutants but sits within a flood plain, adjacent to a chalk stream of national importance. Yet the application form states the existing drainage system as “unknown”. This is woefully inadequate information.

8. As the proposal will increase the number of car movements per day via an already unsafe entrance/exit, I would question whether Dorset Council Highways have fully understood the proposal?

To conclude, the proposal is contrary to several guiding principles of Policy WMC1, HE2 and DES2. There is insufficient information to guarantee that there will not be an environmental catastrophe.

For these reasons the application should be rejected.

.....

Rumen Velev

I fully support this application for the below reasons,

-Wimborne has not got any hand wash facility business, and Wimborne citizens need that service.

- Location is already a car park and has traffic and a slight increase of the traffic won't create a problem.

- that the Business request has completed all legal and technical requirements.

- I believe Wimborne residents should be served with high end services and applications. Wimborne needs change in a positive way , and this business enterprise will be one of them. I believe this will bring more attraction to town centre, people will enjoy their food and drink when their cars are being washed and will be going home happy with shining cars.

Hope this can be granted and will be serving Wimborne for many years.

.....

James Cain - Planning Base Ltd - planning consultant and the agent

I have read the officer's report and agree wholly with the contents of it. This proposal should be approved and we have followed to the letter the appropriate planning guidance. I have experience of appeal hearings concerning car washes in urban areas and have won costs against local authorities on the subject (see PINS Refs 3013850 and 3193984 for example).

In this application at the rear of 5 High Street, we undertook pre-application consultation with the conservation officer and highways authority and have been meticulous in terms of satisfying the necessary issues with regards to access, noise and conservation. We have provided professional reports from outside consultants where necessary and the scheme has been produced by a local RIBA practice. There are consequently no objections from the various statutory consultees and that is testament to the robustness of this application.

As your officer concludes, there are no grounds to refuse this application and the applicant will comply fully with the proposed conditions set out. He is eager to start in 2022 and create employment in the town.

This will bring into being a much needed facility for the town of Wimborne and will save on numbers of car journeys by locating a car wash in the town centre within an existing car park. It is the epitome of sustainability and accessibility as the car drivers of Wimborne won't have to travel to have their vehicles cleaned.

I trust that Members can see the efforts put into the preparation of this application and that it can now be approved at long last.

.....

P/HOU/2021/02711 - CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT PORCH AT 1 HILLSIDE AFFPUDDLE

Paul Foot - Agent's Statement

The size of the proposed porch extension has been carefully considered based on:

- Previous pre-application advice where an earlier design was rejected for being too large.
- The need to provide a space which is more usable than the existing porch.
- Built with cavity walls to current Building Regulations standards.
- The application design is of moderate size and does not overpower the applicant's or the neighbour's properties.

The roof has been designed to be in character with the existing house. The pitched roof would be tiled to match the main house. It is common practice to design porches with lean-to roofs on all types of properties whether historic or more modern.

A flat roof would have to be a lot higher at the eaves than that of the pitched roof proposed to provide adequate internal headroom and to achieve the insulation levels required under the Building Regulations. The imposing height of this resulting flat roof would be out of character to this property and the Conservation Area as a whole.

Geoff Sagar - applicant

I would like to offer comment which disagrees with the recommendations of the Case Officer for this application and I would urge the committee to please approve this application.

This application is being made simply to improve the appearance and general utility of the property, to bring it more in line with

- Current building regulations (replacement of poorly insulated roof and single-glazed windows)
- General expectations of ground floor space for a typical 3-bedroomed property
- Space and utility requirements for a family home where home-working with a young family is now becoming the norm.

The design of the proposed scheme has been specifically made to incorporate building methods from the main property to minimise visual impact and to provide consistency with the main property and neighbouring buildings. Therefore, we refute your comment 3.0 that the proposed porch would have a *“dominating effect”*; an opinion which is supported by our neighbour’s comment that *“the porch will be a considerable improvement and will not clash with the existing building – it will enhance it”*. This assessment seems to be endorsed by your report’s later comment on page 118 that the proposal is *“of a modest size... would have no adverse implications for occupants of neighbouring property.”* In addition, it should be clarified that the building-to-building distance to our neighbour you have referred to in this comment of 33m is incorrect, the actual distance is 51m, and we are not directly opposite them.

We agree with the description in section 5.0 of your report that the property is *“not of historic significance”* but your comment regarding visibility is factually incorrect, as it refers only to screening from a deciduous tree and ignores the presence of evergreen Privet hedges to the road and Photinia hedge on the driveway.

Your comment on page 116 regarding the proposal making *“substantial increase in size and massing”* should be considered alongside the fact that this design is only approximately a 6% increase in current lower ground floor area, and the design’s footprint incorporates cavity walls to replace the current single-skin brick wall.

Furthermore, your comments relating to the characterisation of cottage development are inconsistent with recent developments which have been permitted in the village for properties on the south side to the main road (where we are located), so it seems unfair that our proposal is being recommended for refusal?

Finally, I would like to refute your comment on page 119 that pre-application advice was offered. This was not the case when our application was made (*re: telephone conversation with Ros Drane, May 2021*). Therefore, your assertion that *“the applicant was advised that the proposal did not accord...”* is factually incorrect.

.....

Sue Jones – Chairman of Affpuddle & Turnerspuddle Parish Council

...

The Parish Council supports this application. Overall, it considers it a minor change to the property which is situated amongst a very varied collection of more recent none – listed homes. Parish Councillors do not consider that the proposal would have any significant impact on the special character and historic interest of the conservation area. In contrast it would seem to enhance the appearance of the property and offer a real increase in the quality of life of the applicant.

Whilst the Parish Council appreciates the point of view the Conservation Officer has reported, the question of whether the application would cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Piddle Valley Conservation Area is necessarily a subjective one. In this case the Parish Council considers that the proposed design does not have a dominating affect in the Conservation Area.

Whilst the site is elevated it is well screened by hedging, fencing and a substantial apple tree. Whilst the apple is deciduous it remains as a screening silhouette during winter months. The green fencing and substantial evergreen hedging comprising privet and photina screens the property looking up from and along the road as does a high boundary privet hedge between the property and its adjoining neighbouring property 2 Hillside.

Beyond the road the applicant looks onto open countryside which does not have close footpaths or bridleways. As such it is difficult to see how the Conservation Areas character and historical interest could be detrimentally affected by the impact of the proposed modest extension. In the opinion of the Parish Council the proposal will enhance the appearance of the property which will replace a rather flimsy flat roof addition with a roof that will be more in keeping with the existing tiled roof of the house.

The property is one of many properties extending on this long stretch of road with the majority enjoying an elevated position. Properties have been added and extended over decades and consequently the streetscape is very mixed in terms of style and materials. Taken in the context of this setting Parish Councillors do not consider the proposal would harm the character of the Conservation Area, and on balance it would enhance it.

Parish Councillors are familiar with the site and several have visited the location in person following this application. The Parish Council voted unanimously to support this application and continues to do so following the Conservation Officers report.

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 2.15 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank