

<b>Application Number:</b>	P/RES/2021/02896
<b>Webpage:</b>	<a href="https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/">https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/</a>
<b>Site address:</b>	North Honeymead Field North Fields Sturminster Newton, Dorset
<b>Proposal:</b>	Application for approval of reserved matters for appearance, landscaping, layout & scale in relation to outline approval 2/2018/1749/OUT (& subsequent revisions)
<b>Applicant name:</b>	Bellway Homes Limited (Wessex)
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Ross Cahalane
<b>Ward Member(s):</b>	Cllr Carole Jones

#### 1.0 Nominated Officer:

I confirm that I wish to refer this application to the planning committee. Whilst the principle of residential development has already been established by the outline consent, I can nonetheless see merit in this reserved matters application being considered by the planning committee, given the relatively significant scale of the proposal (114 homes), and in light of the requests made for committee referral by Cllr Jespersen, Cllr Jones and the Town Council.

#### 2.0 Summary of recommendation:

GRANT subject to conditions

#### 1.0 Reason for the recommendation:

- The principle of residential development on this site has already been established
- Para 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise
- The proposal is acceptable in its design and general visual impact
- There is not considered to be any significant harm to residential amenity
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application

#### 4.0 Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	Already established by the outline planning permission.

Layout	The layout responds to its position on the countryside edge, with lower density housing along the perimeter. The revised layout now provides the additional footpath links to provide the necessary permeability throughout the site.
Scale	The proposal is acceptable in terms of design and scale, and would provide an appropriate and positive town edge setting, including perimeter landscaping with natural surveillance and links to public footpaths and the countryside.
Appearance	The scale of buildings would be primarily two-storey, with some 2.5 storey dwellings and two flat buildings up to three storey within the centre of the site. This is appropriate in the context of the site and accords with the Neighbourhood Plan.
Landscaping	Revised landscape proposals have been submitted to address the concerns raised by the Council's Landscape Architect. The additional new tree planting now proposed throughout the development will help the proposal integrate into the landscape.
Affordable Housing	A policy-compliant 25% provision is proposed – 20 units for Affordable Rent and 9 for Shared Ownership. These will be provided and maintained by a Registered Provider in accordance with the s106 legal agreement.
Highway safety	The Highway Authority has raised no objections on highway safety, policy or capacity grounds.
Residential amenity	It is not considered that the proposal would lead to adverse impact on the residential amenity of surrounding neighbours.
Flood risk	The full and precise drainage details are subject to the Condition 11 of the outline permission, which requires submission of maintenance and management details for the SuDS scheme and any receiving system for agreement prior to commencement. It is considered that the current Reserved Matters scheme provides sufficient space on site to accommodate the attenuation requirements
Ecology	The Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, submitted to seek discharge of Condition 16 attached to the outline permission, has been amended to overcome the concerns raised by Dorset Wildlife Trust.
Other matters	The proposed planning conditions address, amongst other things, potential contamination and appropriate provision of electric vehicle charge points.

## 5.0 Description of Site

The site is a single arable field measuring 8.85ha located off the north side of the North Fields highway, on the northern edge of Sturminster Newton. The site itself rises slightly from 54.5 AOD to the east to 62.5 AOD to the west. It is surrounded on 3 sides by mature trees and hedgerows, with the adjacent woodland to the east part

of woodland TPO 54/8/02. Ground levels rise to the northwest, northeast and south of the site.

To the north of the site is open countryside and the site has a landscaped northern boundary to the large fields beyond. To the west, the site borders Sturminster Newton Football Club pitch, with Sturfit Leisure Centre and Sturminster Newton High School further to the west. The east boundary borders woodland and an undesignated trail (permissive path) known as Green Lane. This tree belt separates the site from the housing on Chivrick Close. The southern edge is bounded by fencing and the rear gardens dwellings of North Fields. The gradient of this neighbouring development generally follows that of the application site.

The built-up area in the vicinity of the site is made up of predominantly late 20th century residential development together with some community, education and community uses. North Fields, immediately to the south and where the site access has been approved, is a high-density residential estate development where building heights are mainly 1 – 2 storeys. There are some 3 storey dwellings, including adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. Dwellings are in terraces or linked detached with some apartment blocks with parking in courts or on-plot.

There are no designated heritage assets within 300m of the site. Butts Pond Meadow, a local nature reserve and Site of Nature Conservation Interest, is located approximately 270m south of the site. The site is within flood zone 1 and the closest main river is the River Stour approximately 700m to the west. There is a ditch along the south eastern boundary of the site.

## **6.0 Description of Development**

This application seeks approval of reserved matters for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in relation to outline approval 2/2018/1749/OUT (and its revised site access approved under P/VOC/2021/02026). In line with the approved outline application, this application proposes 114 units, comprising:

- 11 x one-bedroom apartments
- 30 x two-bedroom dwellings, mainly in the form of semi-detached dwellings, terrace dwellings and apartments
- 55 x three-bedroom dwellings, in the form of detached, semi-detached and terrace dwellings
- 18 x four-bedroom dwellings, in the form of semi-detached and detached dwellings

The above includes 29 affordable homes, including affordable rent and shared ownership. The affordable homes will be clustered in four locations across the development and will be indistinguishable from the market homes.

The proposed dwellings would be mainly two storey in form, with some 2.5 storey dwellings with front dormers located in the central area of the scheme. Two apartment buildings are proposed which are up to three storey, but have lowered eaves and some dormer windows.

Vehicular access to the site will be from the outline approved location off North Fields, now via a T-junction as approved under P/VOC/2021/02026. Parking spaces are generally located on-plot or street facing, albeit the central and southwestern areas incorporate central parking courts. Many of the larger detached and semi-detached dwellings feature garages. Visitor spaces are distributed throughout the scheme. Bin storage is generally on plot, with nominated bin collection points for the flats and northern and eastern edge areas.

The boundary landscaping is provided throughout the site with grass verges and street trees providing relief and filtering views within the street scene. A landscaped buffer has been provided to the north of the site, with an area of open space incorporating SuDS to the east, and a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) in the north eastern corner of the site.

Amended plans were received following concerns raised by the Council's Highways, Landscape, Urban Design and Housing Enabling Teams, and will be referred to below in planning assessment.

## 7.0 Relevant Planning History

- 2/2018/1749/OUT Decision: Granted Decision Date: 25/04/2020

Develop land by the erection of up to 114 no. dwellings, form vehicular access, associated infrastructure and public open space (Outline Application to determine access).

- P/VOC/2021/02026 Decision: Granted Decision Date: 08/12/2021

Develop land by the erection of up to 114 no.dwellings, form vehicular access, associated infrastructure and public open space (Outline Application to determine access).(Variation of Condition Nos. 1, 6, 12 and 16 of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2018/1749/OUT to allow for the replacement of the consented mini-roundabout with a T-junction, and submission of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan prior to approval of Reserved Matters rather than prior to submission of Reserved Matters).

- Pre-application advice (P/PAP/2020/00003) for the Reserved Matters was provided in March 2021.

## 8.0 List of Constraints

Within settlement boundary of Sturminster Newton

Part of site is within surface water flood risk area

SSSI impact risk zones: Blackmore Vale Commons and Moors; Piddles Wood

Group woodland TPO adjacent to the site

## 9.0 Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website.

### Consultees

**Dorset Wildlife Trust** – comments (*provided on 01/10/2021 prior to amendments, and are referred to in the planning assessment below*)

**Natural England** - no comments to make on this application

**Wessex Water** - no further comments to make at this time

**Dorset Council (DC) – Environmental Health** – no objection, subject to conditions

**DC - Flood Risk Management Team** – objection (*12<sup>th</sup> October 2021 – addressed in the planning assessment below*)

**DC – Highways** – no objection (*summary of comments referred to in the planning assessment below*)

**DC - Housing Enabling Team** – comments (*28<sup>th</sup> September 2021 - referred to in the planning assessment below*)

**DC – Landscape** – Unable to support, because of location of LEAP and tree related issues (*summary of comments provided on 31 January 2022 are referred to in the planning assessment below*)

**DC - Street Lighting Team** – comments (08 September 2021)

- Any of the new estate being proposed for adoptable as public highway must also be lit, as per Dorset Council Street Lighting Policy POLS900, for areas where most roads are already lit
- Where footpaths are separated from the estate roads, in this case by trees, then an additional system of lighting will be required upon them, if those footpaths are to be adopted as public highway. Placing all the adoptable footpaths alongside the estate roads with any trees at the rear will reduce the lifetime energy and carbon emissions, as only one system of lighting would be required instead of two
- Roads and footpaths, adoptable as public highway and hence requiring street lighting, on the periphery of the estate should be avoided or minimised where possible. Instead adoptable roads and footpaths should be kept to within the built area, using the blocking effect of the houses to reduce outward light pollution and the overall visibility of the estate from a distance at night
- Some areas of the estate have arrangements for off street parking and/or tree planting that will not allow any locations for a system of street lighting to be achieved, which will conflict with the adoption of its roads as public highway
- Use of generic tree symbols on the highway layout drawings makes the evaluation of their impact on highway lighting difficult. Instead the as planted & mature tree canopy size should both be shown for each tree location and to the same drawing scale

*(Officer response: The Council's Highway Authority has raised no objection, following submission of an amended layout and clarification on the extent of public adoption. The tree and landscaping concerns raised are addressed in the planning assessment below)*

**DC - Urban Design** – Unable to support. (*comments provided on 22 October 2021 prior to amendments, and are referred to in the planning assessment below*):

**Sturminster Newton Town Council** – comments:

- Support the recommendations made in the pre-application officer response ref. P/PAP/2020/00003, although continue to have concerns about access for emergency and utilities services
- Also request this application is considered by the North Area Committee.

### **Representations received**

No representations have been received.

## **10.0 Development Plan - Relevant Policies**

### North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (January 2016)

Policy 1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development  
Policy 2 - Core Spatial Strategy  
Policy 3 - Climate Change  
Policy 4 - The Natural Environment  
Policy 6 - Housing Distribution  
Policy 7 - Delivering Homes  
Policy 8 - Affordable Housing  
Policy 13 - Grey Infrastructure  
Policy 14 - Social Infrastructure  
Policy 15 - Green Infrastructure  
Policy 19 – Sturminster Newton  
Policy 24 - Design  
Policy 25 - Amenity

### Saved Policies of the North Dorset District Wide Local Plan (2003)

Policy 1.7 Settlement Boundaries  
Policy 1.9 Important Open/Wooded Area (*land to west of application site boundary*)

### Sturminster Newton Neighbourhood Plan (2019)

Policy 1. Design and character of buildings and their settings  
Policy 2. Important views and landscape sensitivity  
Policy 4. Local green spaces  
Policy 5. Other green spaces  
Policy 6. Trees in the landscape  
Policy 7. Housing numbers and locations  
Policy 8. Settlement boundary revision  
Policy 9. Housing types (including tenure and size)  
Policy 11. Open space and recreation provision and standards in new housing developments  
Policy 12. Delivering a safe and convenient travel network  
Policy 27. Protecting Honeymead and Northfields character  
Policy 29. North Honeymead Fields

Material Considerations  
National Planning Policy Framework

- Chapter 2. Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 4. Decision-making
- Chapter 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Chapter 6. Building a strong, competitive economy
- Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Chapter 9. Promoting sustainable transport
- Chapter 11. Making effective use of land
- Chapter 12. Achieving well designed places.
- Chapter 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Chapter 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Other material considerations

- Sturminster Newton Town Design Statement SPD 2008: 'Honeymead, Northern Fringe' character area

Development here is described as higher density post 1980s housing that is ubiquitous and typical of the era in which it was built. In the immediate vicinity of Honeymead Lane/ North Fields, development sits shoulder to shoulder in a Neo-Georgian style. It is relatively compact, but with greater massing and a considerable variance in scale, height, orientation and material palette. The combination of poor quality development and lack of landscaping presents a weak edge to the open countryside.

- Landscape designations:

The application site is within the Blackmore Vale and Vale of Wardour National Character Area (NCA). This NCA comprises both the large expanse of lowland clay vale and the Upper Greensand terraces and hills that mark the southern and eastern edges of the NCA, and an area extending northwards around the edge of the Salisbury Plain and West Wiltshire Downs NCA.

At County level, the site sits within the Limestone Hills Dorset Landscape Character Type, covering the shallow north-south ridge between Sturminster Newton and Bourton. Key characteristics experienced near the application site comprise dense hedgerows, expansive generally open landscape and scattered farmsteads and villages.

At local level, the site sits within the North Dorset Limestone Ridges character type, as defined in the North Dorset Landscape Character Assessment 2008 (As Amended). Key features experienced near the application site comprise elevated open plateau areas of undulating farmland landscape, thick dense hedgerows and frequent small copses and plantations.

- Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Residential Car Parking Study Residential Car Parking Provision, Local Guidance for Dorset (May 2011)

- Dorset Council Local Plan Options Consultation document - published on 18 January 2021 (with the public consultation concluding on 15 March 2021).

There are a substantial number of comments to review following this consultation. This plan is therefore still at an early stage of preparation and as such, minimal weight is afforded to it as a material consideration.

## 11.0 Human rights

Article 6 - Right to a fair trial.

Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life and home.

The first protocol of Article 1 Protection of property.

This recommendation is based on adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.

## 12.0 Public Sector Equalities Duty

As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have “due regard” to this duty. There are 3 main aims:

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people
- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove or minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the Public Sector Equalities Duty.

The site is located in a sustainable location, in line with the spatial strategy contained in the local plan. Officers have not identified any specific impacts on persons with protected characteristics. The site is in walking distance of educational facilities, healthcare, and leisure facilities.

## 13.0 Financial benefits

What	Amount / value
	Material Considerations
Affordable housing	To be provided in line with Council policy (25% of total dwellings).
Quantum of greenspace	3.14ha of open space, including provision of a LEAP and LAP and retention of woodland and hedgerow.
Employment created during construction phase	The proposal will support local jobs in the construction sector and will bring about ‘added value’ in the local area through associated spending and economic activity.
Spending in local economy by residents of proposed dwellings	The proposal will support the local economy, providing housing required to support the long-term economic



	growth in the area with new residents spending on goods and services as they move in.
Non-Material Considerations	
Contributions to Council Tax Revenue	According to the appropriate charging bands

#### 14.0 Climate Implications

The Design and Access Statement includes details on sustainable construction and how designs will maximise the contributions of natural resources, including passive measures for light, ventilation and heating. In May 2019, Dorset Council declared a Climate Emergency and there is a heightened expectation that the planning department will secure reductions in the carbon footprint of developments. Climate change can be addressed through a planning condition requiring provision of electrical vehicle charging points at appropriate locations.

#### 15.0 Planning Assessment

The principle of development on this site has been established by way of the outline application (ref: 2/2018/1749/OUT) granted in April 2020. This also approved the means of access to the site, and was amended under P/VOC/2021/02026 to allow for the replacement of the consented mini-roundabout with a T-junction.

Policy 29 (North Honeymead Fields) of the Sturminster Newton Neighbourhood Plan allocates the application site for residential development and includes the following key criteria to be met:

- a mix of housing more suitable to families
- an area of green public open space that extends the North Fields Open Space to the wider countryside. Other smaller areas of amenity green space should also be provided
- there are no 2½ storey or taller, or otherwise conspicuous (e.g. through light coloured rendering), buildings either on the higher ground to the west or on land close to the countryside edge
- the layout includes the provision of a landscaped recreational trail around the northern edge linking to the Leisure Centre and the retention of species-rich hedgerows. The layout of the roads and buildings should be orientated to lead out to this trail, with landscaping included to further soften and create an attractive edge with the countryside
- parking spaces, sufficient for the likely future occupants, are conveniently located to the dwellings they serve, and the streets and planting, designed to avoid on-street parking clutter
- the permeable layout of the development, together with any reasonable traffic management measures secured for the wider local road network, ensures that the issues associated with parking along Honeymead Lane are not made worse and facilitates safe pedestrian movements

The overall proposed design approach is traditional, including some sash windows, cast stone sills, brown tile hanging and decorative brick lintels. However, the Planning Statement advises that the scheme includes four character zones, to ensure some visual logic and variety within the form, appearance and curtilage

landscape treatment of different parts of the site. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) describes these character areas as summarised below.

The Entrance Green dwellings help to create a sense of arrival, providing enclosure and defining this space. Red brick is the principal wall material, with complimentary tile hanging providing interest in the street scene. Window design would be a combination of casement and sash.

Parkland Villas comprise the detached dwellings located along the eastern edge, overlooking the open space in the east of the scheme. Each dwelling would contain buff brick wall materials (some will also have pale colour render entrance features) and varying forms and massing, to provide a distinctive and attractive edge to the eastern side of the development. Hipped roofs predominate, with the majority featuring central chimneys and robust porches.

The Green forms the central core of the scheme, including an area of Public Open Space enclosed and defined by dwellings. The central location within the site is used to accommodate an increased scale through provision of flat buildings up to three storey in height. However, they still reflect traditional forms with use of red brick, pitched roofs and gable features. Some appropriate contemporary details are also incorporated here through use of grey timber-effect cladding, which would add legibility to this important internal area of open space. The framed open space with flanking three-storey buildings also provide a focal point to aid navigation.

Finally, the Woodland Walk encompasses those dwellings facing the tree belt in the north of the site. Due to this wooded location on the rural edge of the settlement, these dwellings have an appropriate two storey scale and massing. With red brick complemented by tile hanging, the rural and informal appearance of these dwellings is appropriate to this edge.

The main issues of this reserved matters application are considered to relate to:

- Layout
- Scale
- Appearance
- Landscaping
- Affordable Housing
- Highway safety
- Residential amenity
- Flood risk
- Ecology
- Other matters

### **Layout**

The Council's **Senior Urban Design Officer** (UDO) commented that the layout and form of housing responds to its position on the countryside edge and is lower density, with predominately detached and semi-detached housing. Across the site, there is a range of housing typologies. The hierarchy of streets is logical, with a more formal street layout along the main east/west and north/south routes and an informal treatment of minor roads and private drives. The layout and pattern of parking

generally corresponds well to the street hierarchy, with main routes through the sites and private drives around the edge of the scheme adopting in plot parking.

However, the UDO considered that the scheme as initially submitted fell short of delivering edge to edge connectivity, as it failed to link its eastern footpath with the existing street network. The UDO also commented that within the northern section of the development, the use of cul de sacs limits permeability with no continuous access for pedestrians and cyclists. However, there is opportunity to create additional access points onto the footpath that runs around the site edge, to provide better connectivity.

The revised layout now provides the additional footpath links as requested to provide the necessary permeability throughout the site, including three eastern edge link points to comply with Condition 9 of the outline planning permission. Many corner units are dual aspect with windows overlooking both streets.

The UDO also advised that there should be a greater distinction in the size of setbacks, with the larger properties on the edge having larger front gardens with brick and railing boundary treatments and the smaller, more central houses having smaller setbacks. However, as the larger edge dwellings face the open space and footpath routes secured under the outline permission, and would provide natural surveillance, officers consider that the chosen layout here is acceptable in this instance. In response, the amended layout provides larger front gardens with brick and railing boundary treatments for the larger properties on the edge, with the smaller, more central houses having smaller setbacks.

Another concern raised by the UDO is that that some of the frontage parking along the minor routes is slightly dominating in some areas. The amended layout breaks up the mass of on-street spaces through the introduction of additional planting (e.g., plots 24-30 to the west; 43-45, 53-62 in the centre; 81-86 towards the east).

The UDO also comments that there are some instances where parking is not particularly convenient for the houses it serves (units 31, 32, 54, 80, and 98, 99, 100 in particular). However, officers note that these units would benefit from direct access between the parking space and private garden area, or a short paved walking route. The amended layout also includes some additional street trees along these minor routes where possible.

Overall, it is concluded that the amended layout satisfactorily addresses the concerns raised by the UDO as set out above, and is considered acceptable and would accord with Policy 4 and 24 of the Local Plan, and the NPPF.

### **Scale**

The UDO commented that the apartment buildings within the central area of the scheme address the street corners well. The eastern block also provides an area of private amenity space for residents which is of great benefit. Although greater in their height and massing, design elements such as stepping down to single storey garages and ensuring some distance between the blocks and neighbouring houses means that the difference in scale has less impact. The UDO however identified an

unacceptable contrast in heights between a row of two-storey dwellings (plots 79-80 and 98-100) and the three-storey flat block (plots 101-111) to the south.

The amended scheme has redesigned the plot 98-100 terrace nearest the flat building to now be 2.5 storey with pitched roof front dormers facing the street, which is now considered by officers to form an appropriate transition to the three-storey flat building. The dwellings to the west of the site have now been reduced in height to be fully two-storey, to comply with the Neighbourhood Plan Policy 29 allocation. As such, the amended scale of the proposal is now considered acceptable.

### **Appearance**

The UDO commented that as there are limited opportunities to positively respond to the character of the immediate area, the detailed design of buildings references architectural elements that are found within the more historic areas of Sturminster Newton. These include some gabled and hipped roofs, dormer and bay windows and simple mono pitch porches.

However, the UDO commented that in some instances, all these features are used within a street, whereas a more considered pattern to their distribution would add to the character and sense of place and be more reflective of the vernacular. In addition to this, using repeating porch designs or incorporating fanlight windows as identifiable motifs within particular areas would add to the quality of the scheme and reflect local architectural precedents.

Along the northern edge of the main east/west street (street elevation B-B) and the eastern side of the central route (street elevation E-E), the UDO also considered that the extent of variety in house types and corresponding roof form gives a reduced sense of rhythm and balance. A more subtle and considered pattern with the incorporation of unifying features such as porch design or shape of doorway would create more of a coherent identity.

The applicant has sought to address the above concerns by amending the elevations to increase uniformity of B-B and E-E along the main spine roads, principally through the alignment of porch canopies, doors, header and sill style. The subtle variation in porch designs throughout the scheme is to distinguish and reinforce the character areas, although there is insufficient floor to ceiling height to add fanlight windows.

The UDO also commented that where two house types join, careful consideration has been given to ensure that roof types and detail fit well together. However, an exception to this is where unit 51 joins units 52 and 53 within the central area. As the rest of the street has a uniformity of unit types and materials, unit 51 sits incongruously within the and would create greater cohesion if it was replaced with the same house type as units 52 and 53. Officers also consider that this concern has been addressed by the amendments, as the above terrace has been split into a pair of semi-detached dwellings and a detached dwelling.

In terms of external materials, the UDO commented that a limited palette of materials gives some rhythm and cohesion, with tile hanging and the use of grey boarding adding interest to key parts of the street scene. This approach works particularly well along the site's eastern boundary, where the pattern of house types and materials

form a strong, identifiable edge to the development (street elevation C-C). The UDO also commented that use of a local stone or render would be more appropriate to the character of the area than buff brick and where tiled roofs are proposed, they should be a multi stock rather than a plain colour. Officers consider that appropriate material samples can be submitted and approved in writing as a planning condition.

In light of all the above, it is considered that the overall proposed layout, scale and appearance as amended would be acceptable. The proposal would comply with policy 24 of the Local Plan, and the NPPF.

### **Landscaping**

SNNP policy 4 identifies local green spaces including the wooded area to the east and open space to the south east. It also highlights the importance of linking areas of open space and wildlife with green corridors including to Butts Pond local nature reserve and Green Lane and the countryside beyond. One of the criteria within SNNP policy 29 requires: *'an area of green public open space to be provided that extends the North Fields Open Space to the wider countryside. Other smaller areas of amenity green space should also be provided. Where opportunities arise, the hedgerows and tree coverage in this area should be extended'*.

The Council's **Senior Landscape Architect (LA)** initial comments state that the ground levels rise to the northwest, northeast and south of the site, together with the woodland on its eastern boundary and the woodland strip within the site on its northern boundary. This means that views from the public rights of way on the higher ground to the north are framed, filtered or screened. However, the LA raised objection because of the location of the proposed Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP), along with tree related issues.

Revised landscape proposals have been submitted to address these concerns raised. The amended layout takes on board the LA's suggestion to extend the proposed footpath along the eastern edge of the site towards the southern boundary, linking to the proposed footway at the entrance to provide convenient access to the public open space to the south of the site. As also suggested, larger tree species are provided within the woodland buffer. The reconfigured layout also provides additional planting around some of the internal parking courts (for example, by Plots 54-64).

The eastern edge of the site has also been supplemented, in terms of both quantum and size of trees. For the avoidance of doubt, the 5m buffer along the western edge does correspond to that shown in the outline approved Landscape and Biodiversity Parameter Plan.

The LA understands the rationale for the revised location of the LEAP, but continues to consider that it should be moved to the south, as it would result in the removal of trees which were intended to provide screening for the scheme under the proposals as envisioned at outline. The applicant has now also provided an amended layout for the LEAP that allows for retention of four of the established trees amongst the play equipment, providing a more naturalised mature setting to soften the visual impact of the proposed tree removals.

Whilst a LEAP was secured under the s106 legal agreement, it did not feature on any of the illustrative or approved plans under the original outline planning permission. Various potential locations were subsequently explored during a pre-application meeting for the reserved matters details, as by that stage it was apparent that the requested LEAP location at the southeast corner of the site would conflict with the preferred SuDS solution (being at the lowest part of the site). It is considered that the current proposed LEAP at the northeast would deliver a naturalised play area, linked to the woodland walk and benefiting from passive surveillance from the nearest dwellings.

The LA supports the inclusion of tree species with a greater height and spread at maturity and the increase in quantum of trees, but remains unconvinced that the north-south orientated streets could be described as tree-lined, and therefore does not consider they meet the requirement of NPPF Para 131 that “*planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined*”. However, the amended layout has bolstered tree planting along the internal roads, in a manner considered as consistent and appropriate with their hierarchy and function.

The UDO also commented in respect of front boundary treatments – that they need to be clearly defined and linked to street types/character areas to reinforce local distinctiveness and give streets a sense of enclosure. Use of hedges will also add ecological and landscape value. The amendments provide further sections of hedgerow to provide positive enclosure and to add ecological and landscape value.

The proposed hard boundary treatments comprise 1.8m high closeboard fencing for the private garden boundaries, although some of the corner/junction boundaries along the estate roads would comprise 1.8m high brick walls. Along the edge of the development, many of the private residential curtilages will be delineated by lower 0.9m picket fences and railing, which is considered appropriate for the countryside edge setting. The precise specification of the proposed road and footpath surfacing materials can be secured by means of planning condition.

#### *Tree impacts*

While the proposed trees would appear to have sufficient space to allow for their mature canopy spread, officers were not convinced there would be sufficient un-compacted soil volumes where trees are to be planted in restricted planting beds surrounded by hard surfaces. Officers therefore suggested that proprietary engineered tree pit systems such as GreenBlue Urban ArborSystem (or similar and approved) are specified in these locations. The landscape plans have now been further amended to include GreenBlue Urban root barriers.

Officers also raised concerns that the proposed tree planting would not appear to have been coordinated with street lighting and underground services, and would recommend that such coordination is evidenced prior to the discharge of landscape as a reserved matter. An amended drainage layout has been provided, to include adjustments to proposed tree planting to demonstrate that there is no conflict.

Additionally, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement has been submitted, which includes a Tree Protection Plan. This provides comprehensive details of construction works in relation to trees that have the potential to be affected

by the development, and also includes details of qualified arboricultural supervision where necessary. Officers consider that the submitted Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan are robust and acceptable.

The loss of trees to facilitate the proposed development, including 17 trees to facilitate the proposed LEAP, would be more than offset by the proposed new tree planting throughout the wider site - which includes a number of street trees. Additionally, all these trees proposed for removal are in the two lower categories (C: low quality; and U: Unsuitable for retention) and as such, it is considered that they are not of an amenity quality to justify retention.

Some tree removal is also necessary to create four new footpaths that will exit the site, as required by Condition 9 of the Outline permission. The proposed grading works to facilitate access to the paths are deemed to not be to the detriment of the adjacent trees, as no excavation will take place and the paths will be constructed using sub soil below topsoil. This will allow for rainwater to soak through to the soil below and is unlikely to hinder the rooting environment.

While excavation work will be required to instal the play equipment within the proposed LEAP, this equipment will be sited outside the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of retained trees. Rubber matting that is required around the play equipment will extend within RPAs, however as this can be installed by removing the top layer of vegetation only, this work will not be to the detriment of retained trees.

A surface water pipe will need to pass through the RPA's of four trees to reach the existing watercourse. Where this pipe will pass through RPAs, sensitive installation will be required. Excavation work in this area will be carried out using an 'air-spade'. This tool utilises compressed air to remove soil from around tree roots causing minimal damage.

### *Conclusion*

The LVIA submitted under the outline application recommended the following mitigation measures;

- retention of the existing trees and hedgerows;
- public parkland to wrap around the proposed housing, providing a soft, gradual transition to the countryside, linking the existing North Fields Open Space to the wider countryside;
- provision of a mix of native and ornamental tree planting, shrubs and hedges throughout the site to integrate new housing and parking courts in their surrounds;
- building heights limited on higher areas of the site to the west; and
- long-term management and maintenance of retained trees and vegetation

Condition 15 of the outline permission requires the reserved matters submission to comply with the above LVIA mitigation measures. It is considered that the submitted reserved matters together with Condition 16 (Landscape and Ecology Management Plan) of the outline permission will secure these mitigation measures.

In light of all the above, officers consider that the proposed landscaping scheme is acceptable. Further planning conditions are proposed to secure its appropriate implementation and management.

## **Affordable Housing**

A policy-compliant 25% provision (29 units) is proposed – 20 units for Affordable Rent (AR) and 9 for Shared Ownership (SO). These will be provided and maintained by a Registered Provider, and this tenure mix is in accordance with the s106 legal agreement signed at outline stage. The affordable units comprise 11x 1-bed AR flats, 8x 2-bed AR flats, 2x 2-bed SO dwellings and 8x 3-bed dwellings (1x AR and 7x SO).

The **Council's Housing Enabling Team (HET)** commented that it is important to ensure that the affordable properties are not disadvantaged by position or size. They should be proportionate to the scale and mix of market housing, be well-integrated and designed to the same high quality, resulting in a balanced community that is 'tenure neutral', where no tenure is disadvantaged. The Council's Urban Design Officer's view is that the affordable units are well integrated and tenure neutral in their design, parking layout and landscaping. The HET also advised that Dorset Home Choice figures indicate that the greatest demand is for family homes, which this scheme will assist in meeting.

The HET also commented that in order to be a more integrated scheme, it would be preferable if the affordable homes could, not only be further spread across the development, but provide the two-bedroom properties as houses with outside space in order to be appropriate family homes. The amended layout now provides affordable housing in five locations and the case officer considers that the affordable units are sufficiently dispersed throughout the scheme to achieve integration. The HET request for provision of two-bedroom dwellings is noted. However, the proposed affordable flats would be sited beside communal and public open space (Local Area for Play facility) provided as part of the overall scheme.

Officers therefore consider that the proposed affordable housing provision within the site is policy compliant in terms of design and integration. The proposed layout of the Affordable Housing has been secured as part of the s106 agreement, which was secured through the outline consent.

## **Highway safety**

The Design and Access Statement advises that residential parking provision is to follow the Dorset Residential Car Parking Study (DRCPS) parking standards. The guidance is reflected in Policy 23 of the Local Plan, Parking Standards. The proposal would comply with this policy.

The initial comments of **Dorset Council Highway Authority (HA)** stated that a speed reducing plateau is needed at the first internal estate junction, to ensure that vehicle speeds within the layout remain at 20mph or lower. Similarly, speed control features were also requested on the estate road that runs to the west of this junction, and on the northern estate road. The HA also identified discrepancies in terms of alignment of footways at junctions and at one of the cul-de-sac turning heads.

The applicant has provided an amended layout in response to the HA comments, which includes speed control features and amendments requested. The



applicant now also confirms that the proposed internal spine road that will serve the northern and western sections of the development is to be offered for public adoption under s38 of the Highways Act. The remainder of the estate road layout is to remain private and its maintenance will remain the responsibility of the developer, residents or housing company. The above can be secured by planning condition.

According to Dorset Council's parking calculator, the optimum level of car parking provision for provides 243 car parking spaces and 23 visitor spaces. The proposed reserved matters layout would provide 252 allocated parking spaces and 26 visitor spaces. The HA comments that the proposed on-site parking, for both cycles and cars, is considered to be appropriate for this location. Refuse collection has been fully considered, although it will be necessary for the applicant to liaise with Dorset Waste regarding the collection from non-adopted highways.

In light of all the above, the HA raise no objection. Condition 7 of the Outline approval requires submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be agreed upon prior to commencement of the development, and Condition 8 requires a Travel Plan to be submitted prior to occupation.

## **Residential amenity**

### *Impact on neighbours*

A number of proposed dwellings would face the existing dwellings of North Fields, adjoining the site to the south. These neighbours comprise a mixture of two and three storey dwellings and flats. The building separation distance to No. 46 North Fields is approx. 11m. However, this neighbour is a flat over garage unit, with first floor rooflights and no ground floor openings facing the proposal site. Further east, the separation distances between buildings would be approx. 20m, apart from the following two exceptions.

The nearest separation to the larger end-terrace dwelling of No. 26 North Fields is approx. 18m. Although this neighbour benefits from tall shrubbery along its rear garden boundary, it is not evergreen. However, the nearest proposed dwellings would be sited at an angle to the side of this neighbour's rear elevation, which would also assist in mitigating amenity impacts. The two-storey separation distance from the proposed Plot 3 to the nearest elevation of No. 2 North Fields would be approx. 16m. However, this neighbouring elevation contains no first-floor windows and is tilted at an angle away from the nearest proposed rear elevation. The distance to the single storey window on the far side of this neighbouring elevation would be approx. 18m, but is considered to be of a sufficient angle to avoid adverse overlooking. The separation distance to the next nearest proposed rear elevation (Plot 4) would be approx. 21m.

Some of the proposed dwellings would face the dwellings of Chivrick Close to the southeast. However, the separation distances and existing intervening landscaping within this neighbouring estate are considered to be sufficient to avoid adverse harm to amenity.

The above proposed built form relationships are considered sufficient to avoid adverse overlooking. The proposed juxtaposition between buildings and garden

areas is also considered sufficient to avoid adverse overshadowing or overbearing effects. It is therefore considered that the proposal would comply with Policy 25 of the LPP1.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has advised that construction hours be limited to 0700hrs – 1900hrs Mondays – Fridays and 0800hrs – 1300hrs on Saturdays, with no activity on Sundays or Bank Holidays. This can be secured by planning condition.

#### *Impact on future occupiers*

The floor plans of many of the proposed 3-bed dwellings indicate five occupiers. Most of these dwellings would meet the minimum space standards if occupied by four persons. Additionally, most of the other proposed dwellings throughout the scheme would exceed the minimum space standards. As such, overall, it is considered that future occupiers would be afforded with sufficient internal living and storage space. Officers also consider that the built form relationships within the scheme would afford future occupiers with sufficient light, outlook and privacy.

#### **Flood risk**

The Council's Flood Risk Management Team (FRMT) raised objection, commenting that the current proposed layout conflicts with the drainage layout submitted at outline stage.

This revised layout must be reviewed by a suitably qualified Drainage Engineer who can confirm that sufficient space has been left on site to accommodate the attenuation requirements previously promised.

The applicant has provided a Drainage Technical Note in response, which advises that varying soakage rates have been determined across the site, however the performance of a soakaway drainage system over the whole the site is considered to be marginal to poor. Therefore, it is proposed to drain the surface water from the development to the existing watercourse along the eastern boundary at greenfield runoff rates.

The development's roof areas and hard standings will be drained by point collection method, i.e. road gullies and rainwater pipes or via areas of porous paving, to be collected in traditional gravity pipe network. Runoff from the pipe network is to be directed to two attenuation basins located on the eastern side of the site, providing sufficient storage for the attenuated flows. The attenuation basins will treat the first flush of the drained area and store the runoff. A Hydro-Brake manhole will limit the discharge from the basins to the existing watercourse at the greenfield runoff rate.

It is proposed to drain the foul water effluent from the proposed development into the existing foul water sewer in the existing road named North Fields. The foul water drainage within the development will be a traditional gravity system discharging into the existing foul sewer.

The FRMT has not outlined a specific conflict, other than to say that the current layout differs from the outline layout. However, the outline drainage does not form the outline approved plans, and is therefore not fixed. The full and precise drainage details will in fact remain subject to the outline pre-commencement Condition 11, which requires submission of details of maintenance and management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. Condition 11 also states that these details should include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

The applicant has advised that the SuDS shown along the southern edge of the woodland on the original illustrative masterplans were not effective, as the slope of semi-dry / wet attenuation areas would have meant they had negligible capacity. Hence the current provision along the eastern end of the site, which also has the advantage of being situated at the lowest part of the site and therefore lending itself to a gravity fed system. Designing out the need for pumping stations also helps to reduce energy consumption.

In light of all the above, it is considered that the Reserved Matters scheme provides sufficient space on site to accommodate the attenuation requirements, and in any event, the full details of the drainage specification are controlled by planning conditions.

## **Ecology**

Dorset Wildlife Trust (DWT) has commented that they are supportive of the proposals for enhancement of the plantation woodland habitat at the northern boundary of the site, and the creation of SUDS features at the eastern boundary of the site - both of which will contribute to the enhancement of the ecological network. However, it was identified that the submitted Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) did not include all measures secured within the outline approved Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP).

The applicant has submitted a revised LEMP accordingly, which now states that the native hedgerows will need to be managed to benefit bat species, namely Greater Horseshoe Bats - to include maintaining a thick and bushy structure, including overhanging branches, to provide perching opportunities. To enable this bushy growth, and to accord with the approved BMEP, the hedgerows will be cut infrequently, every 2-3 years instead of annually.

Management and enhancement of the existing establishing broad-leaved plantation has also been amended in the LEMP, to now include woodland management. The woodland within the site will be managed through sensitive thinning, to ensure that the ground flora will still receive enough light. The thinning should not be undertaken frequently to allow the trees to develop - it should be on rotation with different areas being thinned at different times. This will benefit both the woodland and surrounding species through changing the habitats present. A formal assessment of tree

health/development will be undertaken annually. If trees are not thriving or in poor condition, then growing conditions will be amended. If the specimen does not recover, it will be replaced in the next available planting season. Management will also provide for log piles, which will benefit invertebrates.

The revised LEMP also now advises that where possible, all native species should be locally sourced. It also states that enhancement measures will include 50% of all new residential houses to have built-in provisions for bats and 50% of all new residential houses to have built-in bird boxes. The bat boxes are required to be on all the new houses on the edge of the development which back onto the countryside. A minimum of two bee bricks per dwelling will also be installed. For clarity, compliance with this revised LEMP will be secured by planning condition.

### **Other matters**

The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has recommended a planning condition to ensure that in the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment shall then be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Officers consider that it would also be necessary and reasonable to ensure that prior to first occupation or use of the development hereby approved, a verification report to confirm that the site is fit for purpose, including any agreed remediation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Details of external lighting is the subject of a bespoke condition set out in Condition 14 of the outline planning permission.

## **16.0 Conclusion**

Outline planning permission for the construction of 114 dwellings, with details of access and the provision of 25% affordable housing, was granted with s106 legal agreement in April 2020. The site is also allocated for development under the Sturminster Newton Neighbourhood Plan. Additionally, the Council is still not providing a sufficient supply of housing in the North Dorset area. The site should therefore be brought forward for development without delay.

The principle of development is established subject to the details of reserved matters relating to layout, scale, appearance, and landscape – all of which make up this application.

The applicant has amended the details of the original submission to take account of concerns and comments raised in consultation. It is now considered that the revised plans accord with the outline approved parameters and meet the aims of the Development Plan, having due regard to the Sturminster Newton Neighbourhood Plan and the context of this site.

## 17.0 Recommendation

### **APPROVAL of Reserved Matters, subject to the following conditions:**

1. The development to which these reserved matters and accompanying details relates shall be begun not later than two years from the date of this approval.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

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

- Flat block B elevations (Drawing No. FB-B.e Rev A)
  - Flat block B floor plans (Drawing No. FB-B.p Rev A)
  - Baker elevations – Plots 52-53 (Drawing No. HT.BAK.e Rev A)
  - Baker floor plans – Plots 52-53 (Drawing No. HT.BAK.p Rev A)
  - Ballister floor plans – Plots 4-5 (Drawing No. HT.BALL.p Rev A)
  - Bowyer floor plans – Plot 76 (Drawing No. HT.BOW.p1 Rev A)
  - Cooper elevations – Plots 112-113 (Drawing No. HT.COOP.e3 Rev A)
  - Quilter elevations – Plot 91 (Drawing No. HT.QUIL-2.e Rev A)
  - Quilter floor plans – Plots 41, 79 and 91 (Drawing No. HT.QUIL.p Rev A)
  - Scrivener elevations – Plots 88-89 and 92-93 (Drawing No. HT.SCRI-3.e Rev A)
  - Silversmith elevations – Plot 2 (Drawing No. HT.SILV-4.e Rev A)
  - Silversmith floor plans – Plots 2, 87, 90 and 94 (Drawing No. HT.SILV.p2 Rev A)
  - Slater floor plans – Plot 23 (Drawing No. HT.SL.p Rev A)
  - Tanner floor plans – Plots 46-47 (Drawing No. HT.TANN.p Rev A)
- all received on 10th August 2021
- Highway adoption and S278 works (Drawing No. 043.0027.009)
  - Single garage floor plans and elevations (Drawing Nos. GAR.01.pe1 Rev A and GAR.01.pe2 Rev A)
  - Double garage floor plans and elevations (Drawing Nos. GAR.02.pe1 Rev A; GAR.02.pe2 Rev B)
  - Car port floor plans and elevations (Drawing No. CP.01.pe Rev B)
  - Sales garage floor plans and elevations (Drawing Nos. GAR.03-1.pe Rev A; GAR.03-2.pe Rev A)
  - Cycle store floor plan and elevations (Drawing No. CS.01.pe Rev A)
  - Substation floor plans and elevations (Drawing No. SS.01.pe Rev A)
  - Flat block A elevations (Drawing No. FB-A.3 Rev B)
  - Flat block A floor plans (Drawing No. FB-A.p Rev B)
  - Ballister elevations – Plots 4-5 (Drawing No. HT.BALL.e Rev C)
  - Bowyer elevations – Plot 76 (Drawing No. HT.BOW-1.e Rev B)
  - Chandler elevations - Plots 9-10 (Drawing No. HT.CHAN-1.e Rev C)
  - Chandler floor plans - Plots 9-10 (Drawing No. HT.CHAN.p1 Rev A)
  - Chandler elevations – Plots 81-86 (Drawing No. HT.CHAN-2.e Rev ZC)
  - Chandler floor plans – Plots 81-86 (Drawing No. HT.CHAN.p2. Rev A)
  - Cooper elevations - Plots 11-12, 14-15, 20-22, 65-66 (Drawing No. HT.COOP-1.e Rev B)
  - Cooper floor plans - Plots 11-12, 14-15, 20-22, 65-66 (Drawing No. HT.COOP.p1 Rev B)
  - Cooper elevations – Plots 24-30 (Drawing No. HT.COOP-5.e Rev A)

- Cooper elevations – Plots 43-45 (Drawing No. HT.COOP.e2 Rev B)
  - Cooper elevations – Plots 96-97 (Drawing No. HT.COOP-4.e Rev A)
  - Cooper floor plans – Plots 112-113 (Drawing No. HT.COOP.p3 Rev A)
  - Cooper floor plans – Plots 24-30, 43-45 and 96-97 (Drawing No. HT.COOP.p2 Rev B)
  - Fletcher elevations – Plots 6-8 and 16-19 (Drawing No. HT.FLET-1.e Rev C)
  - Fletcher elevations – Plots 51-52 (Drawing No. HT.FLET-3.e Rev C)
  - Fuller floor plans – Plots 33, 42, 70 and 71 (Drawing No. HT.FULL.p Rev A)
  - Fuller elevations – Plot 42 (Drawing No. HT.FULL-1.e Rev B)
  - Fuller elevations – Plots 33, 70 and 71 (Drawing No. HT.FULL-2.e Rev B)
  - Lymner elevations – Plots 37 and 69 (Drawing No. HT.LYM-1.e Rev A)
  - Mason floor plans – Plots 3, 13, 34-36, 40, 53, 75 and 95 (Drawing No. HT.MAS.p Rev B)
  - Mason elevations – Plots 3 and 40 (Drawing No. HT.MAS-1.e Rev B)
  - Mason elevations – Plots 34-36 and 75 (Drawing No. HT.MAS-2.e Rev B)
  - Mason elevations – Plots 53 and 95 (Drawing No. HT.MAS-3.e Rev A)
  - Quilter elevations – Plots 41 and 79 (Drawing No. HT.QUIL – 1.e Rev B)
  - Scrivener elevations – Plot 1 (Drawing No. HT.SCRI-5.e Rev A)
  - Scrivener floor plans – Plot 1 (Drawing No. HT.SCRI.p2 Rev A)
  - Scrivener floor plans – Plots 38, 48, 73-74, 88-89 and 92-93 (Drawing No. HT.SCRI.p1 Rev B)
  - Scrivener elevations – Plot 38 (Drawing No. HT.SCRI-2.e Rev B)
  - Scrivener elevations – Plots 48, 73 and 74 (Drawing No. HT.SCRI-4.e Rev B)
  - Silversmith elevations – Plot 72 (Drawing No. HT.SILV-3.e Rev B)
  - Silversmith floor plans – Plot 72 (Drawing No. HT.SILV.p1 Rev B)
  - Tailor floor plans – Plots 31, 55-56, 67-68 and 77-78 (Drawing No. HT.TAIL.p Rev B)
  - Tailor elevations – Plot 31 (Drawing No. HT.TAIL-2.e Rev ZC)
  - Tailor elevations – Plots 55-56, 67-68 and 77-78 (Drawing No. HT.TAIL-1.e Rev C)
  - Tanner elevations – Plots 46-47 (Drawing No. HT.TANN.e Rev B)
  - Thespian floor plans – Plots 32, 39, 54 and 80 (Drawing No. HT.THES.p Rev C)
  - Thespian elevations – Plot 32 (Drawing No. HT.THES-2.e Rev B)
  - Thespian elevations – Plots 39 and 54 (Drawing No. HT.THES-1.e Rev B)
  - Thespian elevations – Plot 80 (Drawing No. HT.THES-3.e Rev B)
- all received on 04th January 2022

- Fletcher floor plans – Plots 6-8, 16-19, 49-52 and 98-100 (Drawing No. HT.Flet.p Rev C)
  - Lymner floor plans – Plots 37 and 69 (Drawing No. HT.LYM.p1 Rev B)
  - Lymner elevations – Plots 37 and 69 (Drawing No. HT.LYM-1.e Rev A)
  - Lymner floor plans – Plot 114 (Drawing No. HT.LYM.p2 Rev A)
  - Lymner elevations – Plot 114 (Drawing No. HT.LYM-2.e Rev A)
- all received on 05th January 2022

- Site layout (Drawing No. SL.01 Rev C)
- Parking strategy layout (Drawing No. PP.01 Rev E)
- Surface finishes layout (Drawing No. SFL.01 Rev D)
- Boundary and building materials layout (Drawing No. BDML.01 Rev D)
- Landscape proposals (whole site: Drawing No. BELL 23201)
- Landscape proposals (Drawing Nos. BELL23201 11 Sheets 1-5)
- LEAP play area proposals (Drawing No. BELL23201 21)

- Refuse strategy plan (Drawing No. RSL.01 Rev E)
  - Affordable Housing layout (Drawing No. AHL.01 Rev E)
  - Street elevations (Drawing No. SE.01 Rev D)
  - House type Slater elevations (Drawing No. HT.Sl.e Rev C)
- all received on 03rd February 2022.

- Open space plan (Drawing No. OSP.01 Rev B) – received on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2022

- LAP play area proposals (Drawing No. BELL23201 22 DR) – received on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2022

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

**3.** No development shall proceed beyond damp proof course level until details and samples of all external facing materials (including, walls, roofs and fenestration detail) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with the approved materials and shall also comply with the approved boundary and building materials layout plan (Drawing No. BDML.01 Rev D).

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

**4.** No development shall commence on site until precise specification details of the surfacing materials to be used on the highway and footways (including the private parking courts) are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with the approved materials and shall also comply with the approved surface finishes layout plan (Drawing No. SFL.01 Rev D).

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

**5.** The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement (BELL23201aia-amsA dated 4th January 2022 and as amended on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2022). All trees and hedges shown to be retained in the Tree Protection Plan (BELL23201-03 dated 4th January 2022 and as amended on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2022) shall be fully safeguarded during the course of site works and building operations.

Any trees or hedges removed without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority, or are dying or being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased up to 10 years after first occupation of the last dwelling, shall be replaced with trees or hedging of such size, species in a timescale and in positions as have first been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that trees and hedges to be retained are adequately protected from damage to health and stability throughout the construction period and in the interests of amenity.

**6.** The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied until a scheme to enable the charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations within the development has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully installed prior to first occupation or use of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: To promote the use of more sustainable transport modes

**7.** Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, the following works must have been constructed to the specification of the Planning Authority:  
The proposed traffic management measures to reduce vehicle speeds and facilitate safe pedestrian movement as shown on Drawing No. 043.0027.009 (or similar scheme to be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority).

Reason: These specified works are seen as a pre-requisite for allowing the development to proceed, providing the necessary highway infrastructure improvements to mitigate the likely impact of the proposal.

**8.** The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the amended Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (BELL23201\_LEMP Rev C dated 21st October 2021), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the management, maintenance, and long-term landscape and ecological objectives are met.

**9.** In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and an investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with requirements of BS10175 (as amended). If any contamination be found requiring remediation, a remediation scheme, including a time scale, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to the first occupation or use of the development hereby approved, a verification report to confirm that the site is fit for purpose, including any agreed remediation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority..

Reason: To ensure risks from contamination are minimised.