

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

Application Number:	P/OUT/2021/04873		
Webpage:	Planning application: P/OUT/2021/04873 - dorsetforyou.com (dorsetcouncil.gov.uk)		
Site address:	97 High Street Sturminster Marshall Wimborne BH21 4AT		
Proposal:	Outline application for Access and Layout to demolish a pair of semi detached bungalows and replace with 5 x 3 bedroom dwellinghouses		
Applicant name:	Mrs Julie Terry		
Case Officer:	Gavin Forrest		
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Cook		
Publicity expiry date:	25 February 2022	Officer site visit date:	2 February 2022
Decision due date:	4 March 2022	Ext(s) of time:	4 March 2022

1.0 The application has been referred to committee by the Nominated Officer.

2.0 Summary of recommendation:

Either

- A. GRANT subject to conditions and the completion of a satisfactory planning obligation or
- B. REFUSE if a satisfactory planning obligation is not provided.

(see section 17 for more details)

3.0 Reason for the recommendation: as set out in paras 6.1 at end of the report.

- 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 location is considered to be sustainable and the proposal is acceptable in its design and general visual impact.
- The proposals are not considered to result in harm to the heritage assets Holly Cottage (grade II listed) and 105 High Street (grade II listed), which lie in proximity
- The proposals are considered to be able to achieve a safe and sustainable means of access and egress and will not have a detrimental impact on the highway safety of the surrounding road and pedestrian network.
- The proposals are not considered to have a detrimental impact on the visual or residential amenity currently afforded to the existing properties in the immediate locale.

4.0 Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	The proposals are not considered to depart from the relevant National or Local Plan policies or Supplementary Planning Guidance
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	Acceptable. The proposal is considered to be in an appropriate scale and the layout would have an acceptable impact on the character of the immediate area in accordance with Local Plan policies HE2 and HE3.
Impact on amenity	Acceptable
Impact on landscape and heritage assets	Acceptable
Economic benefits	Acceptable
Access and Parking	Acceptable, subject to conditions
Effect on Biodiversity	Acceptable, subject to conditions and a planning obligation to secure compensation for loss of grassland.
Drainage	Acceptable, subject to conditions

5.0 Description of Site

- 5.1 The application site currently hosts of a pair of 1950s semi-detached bungalows occupying a long plot, approx. 75 metres deep. The existing dwellings are set back from the street by approximately 15m and span the majority of the width of the plot.
- 5.2 The existing and surrounding locale is predominantly residential in nature and within the site there are no major land deviations.
- 5.3 Directly to the north of the site are two Grade II Listed thatched cottages- Holly Cottage, also known as 101 High Street (adjacent to the site) and further north 105 High Street (formerly known as 15 High Street).
- 5.4 The site is flanked by neighbouring dwellings; Holly Cottage lies to the north and 95 High Street, a chalet style property to the south. To the rear the site backs onto the gardens of 10 and 11 Churchill Close.
- 5.5 The existing High Street has retained an overall character and appearance of ad hoc development where buildings have developed on a largely individual basis, creating a mixture of styles and forms, broadly reflective of the time in which they were built.
- 5.6 There is a significant amount of development behind the main street frontage including some estate style development with formal access/road systems.

6.0 Description of Development

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

- 6.1 5 dwellings are proposed to replace the two existing properties; two semi-detached two storey dwellings at the front and a staggered terrace of three two storey dwellings at depth.
- 6.2 The proposal is in outline with details of the access and layout only. The appearance, scale and landscaping are reserved matters.
- 6.3 Compared to the previous application that was the refused, the current proposal has repositioned the access so that it is alongside the northern boundary rather than between the two front properties. This has moved the front properties away from the boundary with Holly Cottage and the layout shows a landscaping strip between the northern unit and the access road.
- 6.4 The rear terraced dwellings are shown sited 9-13m from the rear site boundary thereby maintaining approx. 38m building to building separation distance with the properties on Churchill Close to the rear. There is no significant change in land levels over the site.
- 6.5 As part of the assessment of this application, consideration and understanding of the previous decisions need to be addressed, which is set out in the officer's assessment, at section 15 of this report.

7.0 Relevant Planning History

3/20/1100/OUT-Decision: Refused and appeal dismissed- Appeal decision Date:
26/05/2021
Demolish a pair of semi detached bungalows and replace with 5 x 3 bedroom dwellinghouses

8.0 List of Constraints

Grade: II Listed Building: HOLLY COTTAGE List Entry: 1154792.0; - Distance: 12.22
Settlement Boundary; Sturminster Marshall - Distance: 0
Risk of Surface Water Flooding during a 1 in 100 event – this affects the highway and the proposed landscaping at the front of the site only
Risk of Surface Water Flooding during a 1 in 1000 event – this affects part of the site to the rear of the existing properties but the low risk would not necessitate a sequential test
Areas Susceptible to Groundwater Flooding; Clearwater; >= 75%; - Distance: 0
Wessex Water Risk: Medium Risk of Foul Sewer Inundation
Groundwater Source Protection Zones, The total area needed to support the abstraction or discharge from the protected groundwater source
RAMSAR: Dorset Heathlands (UK11021); - Distance: 4386.57
SSSI (5km buffer): Corfe Mullen Pastures ; - Distance: 4386.57

9.0 Consultations

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

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

Consultees

1. **Sturminster Marshall PC** (received 07/01/2022)
 - Does not fit with character of the area- architectural style, scale, visual impact, relationship to nearby properties
 - Harm to neighbouring Listed Building due to design
 - Insufficient soft landscaping
 - Proposal will exacerbate parking problems
 - Neighbourhood plan evidence work shows need for bungalows so loss of two would be harmful
2. **DC - Highways** (received 15/12/2021)
 - No objection subject to conditions to secure: Vehicle access construction, Turning and parking construction
3. **DC - Building Control East Team** (received 02/12/2021)
 - Fire service vehicular access restricted therefore houses will require sprinkler systems. Alternatively re-design head of access road to provide suitable turning circle.
4. **DC Conservation Officer** (received 11/02/2022)
 - Holly Cottage (grade II listed) and 105 High Street (grade II listed) lie in proximity but no harm has been identified to these assets' significance.
5. **Dorset Wildlife Trust** (received 17/12/2022)
 - Consider that insufficient ecological information has been provided on which to assess the impacts of the development upon biodiversity.
(officer note: Biodiversity plan subsequently provided, certified 27/09/2022)
6. **Ward Member** (received 03/12/2021)
 - Cllr Cook 'I am concerned about overdevelopment of the site and of the adverse impact on the adjacent listed properties. If the officer recommendation is at odds with the parish council opinion then I request the item be determined by the Eastern Area Planning Committee.'

Commented [EA1]: Need signed BP

Representations received

The application was advertised by site notices.

2 letters of objection raised the following concerns:

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

- Design issues- overdevelopment, scale and visual impact not compatible with the area
- Impact on neighbouring amenity- loss of privacy including to private gardens, loss of light, noise pollution
- Lack of change since appeal decision
- Impact on house values

2 letters of support noted the following:

- Current bungalows are inefficient use of land and outdated- rooms too small and gardens too large
- Will provide smaller, more affordable family homes.
- Sufficient parking
- Utilises large gardens to increase much needed housing stock rather than use greenfield land. Need for 2 and 3 bedroom family homes identified in Neighbourhood Plan documentation.

One other communication providing comments:

Request that further reserved matters should be considered by the Planning Committee. Tall dark rooflines & elevations to be avoided.

Total - Objections	Total - No Objections	Total - Comments
3	2	5

10.0 Relevant Policies

Development Plan

Adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan:

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

- KS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- KS2- Settlement hierarchy
- KS11 - Transport and Development
- KS12- Parking Provision
- LN1- Size and Types of New Dwellings
- LN2- Design, Layout and Density of New Housing Development
- HE1- Valuing and Conserving our Historic Environment
- HE2 - Design of new development
- HE3 - Landscape Quality
- ME1- Safeguarding biodiversity and geodiversity
- ME2- Dorset Heathlands
- ME6- Flood Management, Mitigation and Defence

Other Material Considerations

Emerging Local Plans:

Paragraph 48 of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant plan policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan are to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

The Dorset Council Local Plan Options Consultation took place between January and March 2021. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the Draft Dorset Council Local Plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision making.

Neighbourhood Plans

Sturminster Marshall Neighbourhood Plan- In preparation – very limited weight applied to decision making

Supplementary Planning Document/Guidance:

Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 Supplementary Planning Document

National Planning Policy Framework:

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development plan proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

Relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4. Decision taking: Para 38 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available...and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
- Section 5 'Delivering a sufficient supply of homes' outlines the government's objective in respect of land supply with subsection 'Rural housing' at paragraphs 78-79 reflecting the requirement for development in rural areas.
- Section 11 'Making effective use of land'

- Section 12 'Achieving well designed places indicates that all development to be of a high quality in design, and the relationship and visual impact of it to be compatible with the surroundings. In particular, and amongst other things, Paragraphs 126 – 136 advise that:

The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

It is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

- Section 14 'Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change'
- Section 15 'Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment'- In Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty (para 176). Decisions in Heritage Coast areas should be consistent with the special character of the area and the importance of its conservation (para 173). Paragraphs 179-182 set out how biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.
- Section 16 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment'- When considering designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance (para 199). The effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account (para 203).

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

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

- 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. It is noted that the proposal will replace single storey dwellings with two storey which may be less suitable for those with mobility issues but overall, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed residential development will have a neutral impact on those with protected characteristics.

13.0 Financial benefits

Given the size and scale of the proposals within this Planning Application, there are not considered to be any financial benefits or implication associated with the proposals.

14.0 Environmental Implications

There are not considered to be any environmental implications raised as a result of this Planning Application.

15.0 Planning Assessment

15.1 The main planning considerations are:

- The principle of development
- The impact on the character of the area
- Impact on heritage assets
- Impact on amenity
- Impact on highway safety
- Impact on biodiversity

These and other issues are considered below.

The principle of development

15.2 The application site lies within the urban area where development is acceptable in accordance with policy KS2. Policy LN2 requires that development should maximise the density of development to a level which is acceptable for the locality. This is considered below.

Impact on the character of the area

15.3 As the proposal is in outline with appearance and scale as reserved matters, consideration is limited to whether the layout would be acceptable within the site’s context nevertheless it is helpful to consider the previous reason for refusal and the Inspector’s comments on this.

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

- 15.4 The previous reason for refusal read:
'The proposal due to its excessive quantum and uncharacteristic layout and design fails to respond to the prevailing grain and character of the existing street and would be harmful to the local distinctiveness of Sturminster Marshall. The proposal fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions and is incompatible with its surroundings. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan 2014.'
- 15.5 At appeal the Inspector noted that there were a wide variety of dwellings within the settlement of Sturminster Marshall. Whilst there have been changes to the overall form and appearance over the years, the *'High Street has retained an overall character and appearance of ad hoc development where buildings have developed on a largely individual basis, creating a rich tapestry of styles and forms, broadly reflective of the time in which they were built'* (para 5).
- 15.6 The Inspector recognised that there is a significant amount of development behind the main street frontage including some estate style development with formal access/road systems but noted that the plots fronting the High Street appropriately responded to the prevailing character of street scene with a degree of informality and individuality. Although the existing pair of dwellings on the site had a symmetrical layout these were of small scale whereas the proposed dwellings would have a stronger presence. The Inspector was concerned that *'the formal symmetrical arrangement would be strikingly apparent and would detract significantly from the character and appearance of the area'* contrary to policy HE2.
- 15.7 In response to these comments the revised proposal has a pair of semi-detached dwellings at the front of the plot, set behind the building line of the existing bungalows. Again, the layout suggests a symmetry, but this in itself would not be objectionable provided the design provides differentiation which can be secured via a Reserved Matters application.
- 15.8 The vehicular access to the terrace of three properties at the rear will run along the northern boundary following the route of existing hard surfacing leading to a garage. Whilst the parking area in front of the dwellings will introduce a relatively formal arrangement it is anticipated that this can be appropriate softened by landscaping details, again to be agreed at Reserved Matters stage. The parish council has raised concerns about insufficient soft landscaping opportunities, but the layout identifies sufficient space to maintain boundary hedging and the space to the front of the site is large enough to accommodate meaningful planting.
- 15.9 The Inspector did not comment on the quantum of development, appearing satisfied that five dwellings might be accommodated if they were appropriately designed. With the access now positioned to the north of the site and the principal elevations of the terrace gently staggered, the formality of the layout and prominence of the development at depth within the street scene will be reduced to an acceptable degree so as to accord with policy LN2.

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

- 15.10 The set back of the dwellings, approx. 17m from the highway, and their positioning on the southern part of the plot will also achieve sufficient separation with Holly Cottage to the north that views of the flank wall of that property and trees within the garden which contribute to the street scene will be maintained despite the introduction of two storey development.
- 15.11 Overall, the revised access and layout are judged to accord with policy HE2 and overcome the previous reason for refusal no. 1.

Impact on heritage assets

- 15.12 Directly to the north of the site are two Grade II Listed thatched cottages- Holly Cottage a.k.a. 101 High Street (adjacent to the site) and further north 105 High Street (formerly known as 15 High Street).
- 15.13 There is a statutory requirement for decision makers to ensure that the setting of the listed buildings is preserved or enhanced. Policy HE1 also requires the significance of heritage assets to be protected and enhanced while Chapter 16 of the NPPF provides details of how decision making should be undertaken to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
- 15.14 Reason for refusal 2 of decision 3/20/1100/OUT read:
'The proposal due to its excessive quantum, uncharacteristic layout and design and proximity to the two Listed Buildings to the north of the site will lead to "less than substantial harm" to the setting of those Listed Buildings. No public benefit has been identified that outweighs the harm to these heritage assets. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and Policy HE1 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan 2014.'
- 15.15 At appeal the Inspector judged that the setting of the listed buildings was '*generally derived from their position in the varied, informal townscape that has evolved over the lifetime of the listed buildings*' and that the position of the proposed dwellings would not vie for attention in the streetscape so would not result in harm.
- 15.16 The Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that the Inspector's findings remain pertinent for the current proposal. The main contributory elements of the setting of both listed buildings that could be affected by the proposal are the visual experience from the High Street and the group value.
- 15.17 In relation to Holly Cottage, the layout identifies that the front dwellings will sit in the approximate location of the existing bungalows and the rear terrace is set well into the plot so, subject to reserved matters being acceptable, the proposals are not anticipated to detract or distract from the key aspects of the asset's setting.
- 15.18 For 105 High Street, which is sited further from the application site, the visual experience and group value will also be preserved.
- 15.19 No harm has been identified to either property on the basis of the proposed positioning and distances achieved between the development site and listed

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

buildings so neither paragraph 201 nor 202 of the NPPF are considered to be engaged. The previous reason for refusal is no longer valid.

Impact on amenity

- 15.20 The site is flanked by neighbouring dwellings; Holly Cottage lies to the north and 95 High Street, a chalet style property to the south. To the rear the site backs onto the gardens of 10 and 11 Churchill Close.
- 15.21 Reason for refusal no. 3 of 3/20/1100/OUT read:
'The proposal, due to the scale and proximity of the proposed detached dwelling on the northern side of the site to Holly Cottage will have a harmfully overbearing impact on, and cause significant loss of light to, the rear garden of Holly Cottage, harming its amenity, contrary to Policy HE2 and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.'
- 15.22 The Inspector did not agree with this assessment, noting that there was a high boundary hedge along the southern boundary separating Holly Cottage from the site which already limited outlook while the distances between the properties were sufficient to avoid any significant loss of light and the development would not appear harmfully overbearing.
- 15.23 The current proposal has moved the front properties away from the boundary with Holly Cottage, further reducing the impact on that property. The use of the access along the northern boundary to serve the three rear dwellings could introduce additional noise but this could be mitigated by landscaping- ideally by the retention of the existing hedge or by its replacement which would be resolved at Reserved Matters stage. Amended plans have been received to increase the width of the landscaping strip adjacent to the boundary with Holly Cottage by 0.25m to assist in retaining planting.
- 15.24 Concerns have been raised by third parties about loss of privacy to neighbouring gardens and loss of light. The rear terraced dwellings are shown sited 9-13m from the rear site boundary (currently demarcated by high fencing) thereby maintaining approx. 38m building to building separation distance. There is no significant change in land levels over the site. The Inspector already judged that there would be no significant loss of light for Holly Cottage from the rear terrace and the impact will be less for properties to the south and west. It is recognised that direct and oblique overlooking of neighbouring gardens may be introduced from new first floor windows but there would appear to be sufficient options for appropriate window positioning which will be considered fully at the Reserved Matters stage.

Impact on highway safety

- 15.25 The existing highway access is to be revised to provide a single access to the north of the site. The Highways Authority is satisfied with the proposed visibility splays and has no objection subject to conditions to secure the access and internal arrangements including parking spaces.
- 15.26 The parking provision on the scheme exceeds the Dorset Council parking standard recommendation of 1 unallocated and 1 visitor parking space by providing 3 visitor spaces on site. This is welcomed in this location to avoid any significant increase in

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

pressure on parking on the local highway. The proposal is found to accord with policies KS11 and KS12.

Impact on biodiversity

- 15.27 The application site lies within 5km but beyond 400m of Dorset Heathland which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest and as a European wildlife site. The proposal for a net increase of three residential units, in combination with other plans and projects and in the absence of avoidance and mitigation measures, is likely to have a significant effect on the site. It has therefore been necessary for the Council, as the appropriate authority, to undertake an appropriate assessment of the implications for the protected site, in view of the site's conservation objectives.
- 15.28 The appropriate assessment (separate document to this report) has concluded that the likely significant effects arising from the proposal on the Heathland are wholly consistent those identified in the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD and the mitigation measures set out in the Dorset Heathlands 2020-2025 SPD can prevent adverse impacts on the integrity of the site. The SPD strategy includes Heathland Infrastructure Projects (HIPs) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). In relation to this development the Council will fund the HIP and SAMM provision via the Community Infrastructure Levy. The strategic approach to access management is necessary to ensure that displacement does not occur across boundaries.
- 15.29 With the mitigation secured the development will not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the designated site so in accordance with the Habitats Regulations 2017 planning permission can be granted in this regard; the application accords with policy ME2.
- 15.30 In relation to onsite effects, it is a requirement of all development to enhance the natural environment, as stated in the NPPF (2019 as amended), paragraphs 8, 170 and 175. The application was accompanied by a negative bat survey but a Biodiversity Plan has since been received which identifies:
- Construction measures to minimise the likely effects on biodiversity
 - one of the houses will provide a new loft space suitable for brown long-eared bats
 - a compensation payment of £3988.94 will be secured in relation to loss of grassland
 - 3 Bat bricks, 3 sparrow terrace bird bricks, hedgehog holes in fences, 10 bee bricks, at least one apple tree and additional hedgerow planting
- 15.31 With these proposals secured by condition and the funding secured by s106 obligation, the proposal is acceptable in accordance with policy ME1.

Other issues

- 15.32 The site access would not be suitable for service by the Council's Waste Team but bin stores and a collection point on the front of the site have been identified.

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

- 15.33 Part of the site is at risk from flooding in 1 in 1000 events. Although this does not preclude development it is necessary to impose a condition securing a surface water drainage scheme.
- 15.34 Objectors have referred to impacts on house prices but this is not a material planning consideration.

16.0 Conclusion

The proposals have overcome previous reasons for refusal. For the above reasons the layout and access are judged to be acceptable in relation national and local planning policies and so accord with the development plan with no material considerations suggesting that the development is unacceptable.

17.0 Recommendation

A) Grant, subject to the completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in a form to be agreed by the legal services manager to secure the following:

Contributions required for Biodiversity enhancement and gains

And subject to the following conditions:

1. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until details of all reserved matters (appearance, scale and landscaping) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory development of the site.

2. An application for approval of any 'reserved matter' must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
tbd-127 OU-02 Location Plan
tbd-127 OU-04 Proposed Site plan

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

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

5. The detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain strategy set out within the approved Biodiversity Plan certified by the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team on 27/09/2022 must be completed in full (including photographic evidence of compliance being submitted to the Local Planning Authority in accordance with section J of the Biodiversity Plan) prior to the substantial completion, or the first bringing into use of the development hereby approved, whichever is the sooner. Thereafter the mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain measures shall be permanently maintained and retained.

Reason: To mitigate, compensate and enhance/provide net gain for impacts on biodiversity.

6. Before any ground works start on site a detailed surface water drainage scheme for dealing with surface water drainage from the development must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. This must include:
 - the results of an assessment into the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS)
 - details of a management and maintenance plan for the drainage schemeThe appropriate design standard for the surface water drainage scheme must be the 1 in 100 year return period rainfall event with a 40% allowance for climate change.
The approved drainage scheme must be implemented before the first occupation of the building/any of the buildings and thereafter maintained and managed in accordance with the agreed management plan.

Reason: These details are required to be agreed before ground works start in order to ensure that consideration is given to installing an appropriate drainage scheme to alleviate the possible risk of flooding to the site and elsewhere for the lifetime of the development.

7. Before the development hereby approved is first occupied the first 5m of the vehicular access, measured from the rear edge of the highway (excluding the vehicle crossing- see Informative Note below) must be laid out, constructed, and surfaced, to a specification which shall have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

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

8. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised the turning and parking areas shown on Drawing Number 0U-04 must have been constructed. Thereafter, these areas must be permanently maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for parking and turning.

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

Eastern Area Planning Committee
7 December 2022

B) Refuse permission for the reasons set out below if the agreement is not completed by 7 March 2023 or such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning.

1. The proposed development fails to appropriately mitigate or compensate for the loss of biodiversity on the site contrary to policy ME1 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan and paragraphs 174 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative Notes:

1. The vehicle crossing serving this proposal (that is, the area of highway land between the nearside carriageway edge and the site's road boundary) must be constructed to the specification of the Highway Authority in order to comply with Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant should contact Dorset Highways by telephone at 01305 221020, by email at dorsethighways@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Dorset Highways, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the public highway.

2. Informative: National Planning Policy Framework Statement

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- offering a pre-application advice service, and
- as appropriate updating applications/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this case:

- The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer.

3. The applicant needs to be aware that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be applied to development on this site. The amount of levy due will be calculated at the time the reserved matters application is submitted.
4. Informative: This permission is subject to a legal agreement made pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated ## ## relating to contributions towards biodiversity enhancement and gains