

Application Number:	P/OUT/2021/05309
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Land Adjacent Broadmead Broadmayne
Proposal:	Development of up to 80 residential dwellings, together with open space, allotments and enhanced drainage features (outline application to determine access only)
Applicant name:	Southern Strategic Land LLP
Case Officer:	Matthew Pochin-Hawkes
Ward Member(s):	Cllr. Roland Tarr

1.0 Given the number and scope of comments from consultees and members of the public, the Head of Planning has requested this application be considered by Planning Committee.

2.0 Summary of recommendation:

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would result in the unnecessary development of best and most versatile agricultural land for residential development outside the defined development boundary. Furthermore, it would result in an unsustainable pattern of development which would be disproportionate in scale to the village of Broadmayne and harmful to the countryside and local character through adverse visual effects and impacts on the countryside-edge character of this part of Broadmayne as a result of the quantum, density and scale of the development. The proposal is contrary to Policies SUS2, ENV1 (part iii), ENV8 (part ii), ENV10 and ENV12 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and the NPPF (2021).
2. In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement to secure affordable housing the proposal would be contrary to Policy HOUS1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and the NPPF (2021).
3. In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement to secure provision of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) the associated likely significant effects on Dorset Heathlands are not mitigated, contrary to: West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) Policy ENV2; Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 SPD (2006); National Planning Policy Framework (2021) Paragraphs 174 and 180; and the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats Regulations 2017.
4. In the absence of mitigation to ensure nutrient neutrality the associated likely significant effects on Poole Harbour SSSI, SPA and Ramsar through increased nitrogen and phosphate loads are not mitigated, contrary to: West

Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) Policy ENV2; National Planning Policy Framework (2021) Paragraphs 174 and 180; and the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats Regulations 2017.

5. In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement to secure a Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) the proposal would be contrary to Policy COM1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and the NPPF (2021).
6. In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement to secure off-site highway improvement works the proposal would be contrary to Policy COM7 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and the NPPF (2021).

3.0 Reason for the recommendation:

3.1 There is a balance to be struck in considering a proposal which would deliver new housing in a location which the Local Plan does not envisage as the most sustainable location for housing.

3.2 The provision of housing outside of the DDB would be contrary to Local Plan Policy SUS2 and there would be local adverse effects caused by residential development of the site. The proposal would fundamentally alter the character and appearance of the site and would erode the countryside-edge character of this part of Broadmayne, an important component of the village's sense of place. Furthermore, it would sterilise best and most versatile agricultural land. The higher density of the site and provision of 2-storey dwellings across much of the site would contrast with the existing character, height and density of the surrounding area and would not be in harmony with local character. The proposals would also fail to mitigate limited visual impacts from the surrounding public right of way network to the south of Broadmayne.

3.3 The benefits of the proposal are not considered to outweigh the harm of the proposals and in principle conflict with policy. The proposed development fails to comply with the development plan as a whole.

3.4 It is recommended that planning permission be refused due to conflict with Policies SUS2, ENV1 (part iii), ENV8 (part ii), ENV10 and ENV12 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015). In addition, in the absence of necessary provision of affordable housing and appropriate mitigation of adverse impacts in respect of Dorset Heathlands and Poole Harbour, provision of a locally equipped area for plan and off-site highway improvement works secured via a Section 106 legal agreement the proposal would conflict with Policies HOUS1, ENV2, COM1 and COM7 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015).

4.0 Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	The principle of development outside of the DDB and loss of best and most versatile

	agricultural land is unacceptable contrary to Policies SUS2 and ENV8. The proposal represents a disproportionate expansion of Broadmayne compared to the size of the village.
Access, highways and highway safety	No unacceptable impacts on highway safety and the residual impacts on the road network would not be severe. In accordance with Policies COM7, COM9 and the NPPF (Para. 111).
Housing mix and affordable housing	Housing mix, tenure and provision of 45% affordable housing aligns with Policy HOUS3 and exceeds the 35% policy requirement of Policy HOUS1. Whilst the applicant has confirmed an intention to provide all housing as affordable, this cannot be secured by legal agreement and is afforded very limited weight in the planning balance.
Impact on the setting of the AONB	The site is not located within the AONB. The development would have an acceptable effect on the setting of the AONB and would not harm its special qualities or natural beauty.
Impact on local landscape and village character	The development would undermine the prevailing character of the area and have a harmful visual effect in conflict with Policies ENV1, ENV10 and ENV12 of the Local Plan.
Layout, design and open space	The illustrative layout is sufficient to form a basis to indicate that the site can be developed satisfactorily for future residents. A reserved matters layout would require significant changes from the illustrative masterplan.
Heritage impacts	No harm to designated heritage assets. Harm through loss of off-site concrete hard standing on the east side of Rectory Road (a Non Designated Heritage Asset) offset by the benefits of the proposal.
Residential amenity	Significant adverse effects on residential amenity would be avoided.
Flood risk and drainage	The proposals would avoid increases in flood risk and would provide off-site betterment by disconnecting existing highway gullies from the foul sewer network.
Ecology	The proposals would deliver biodiversity net gains and potential adverse effects on Dorset Heathlands and Poole Harbour are capable of mitigation.

Trees	All trees would be retained and impacts on existing trees can be suitably managed by condition.
Archaeology	Impacts on archaeology can be appropriately managed through a planning condition securing the implementation of a programme of archaeological work.
External lighting	Acceptable subject to planning conditions.
Minerals safeguarding	A method statement to be secured via planning condition would avoid sterilisation of sand and gravel resources as far as practicable.
Community Infrastructure Levy	Market housing would be CIL liable in accordance with the West Dorset CIL Charging Schedule.
EIA Regulations	An Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

5.0 Description of Site

5.1 The site comprises a 4.7ha square shaped agricultural field in the village of Broadmayne. It lies adjacent to the existing developed areas of the village, surrounded on three sides by dwellings and the Defined Development Boundary.

5.2 The southwest of the site is bound by the rear gardens of dwellings along Martel Close, a post-war cul-de-sac of properties of varying ages and sizes sited in generous plots. To the south lie residential properties along Chalky Road, including the residential infill developments of Knights Mayne / No. 6 Chalky Road (six dwellings) and Lytchetts Park / No. 4 Chalky Road (four dwellings). To the east is Littlemead, a 1980s development of modest terraced and semi-detached properties. North of the site is Broadmead, comprising bungalows set in regular plots. To the northwest lies open countryside and the associated Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) site. The surrounding area has an established low density, somewhat suburban, countryside-edge character of 1-2 storey residential properties and open countryside: markedly different to the more compact historic core of the village, approximately 350m to the east.

5.3 The site is in arable agricultural use with a pronounced fall in levels from northwest to southeast (approximately 65m to 55m AOD). The applicant's Agricultural Land Classifications Report (November 2021) identifies the entirety of the site comprises Best and most versatile Agricultural Land (BMV) split approximately 30% Grade 2 (very good) and 70% Grade 3a (good). A post and rail fence along the Broadmead boundary allows clear views over the field towards the residential properties of Martel Close. To the north of the site (within the SANG site) lies a public bridleway (S9/15) which leads west from Bramble Drove into the wider Public Rights of Way network. To the north of the bridleway is a line of mature beech trees. These provide an important landscape feature and field boundary within the adjacent SANG site.

5.4 The southwestern and southern boundaries of the site are enclosed by mature trees sited within the rear gardens of adjacent dwellings and there is established vegetation along the rear of properties along Martel Close. The Dorset AONB boundary includes the properties of Martel Close and follows the western boundary of the site. The site itself does not fall within the AONB.

6.0 Description of Development

6.1 The application seeks outline planning permission to develop the site for up to 80 dwellings with approval for the access point only and all other matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) reserved for future determination.

6.2 The amount of housing has been reduced over the course of determination from a maximum of 90 dwellings (as originally submitted) to 80 dwellings (as proposed). The applicant has also increased the provision of affordable housing from 35% to 45% and confirmed the intention to provide all homes as affordable. 45% of homes are therefore proposed to be affordable. 35% would have a 70:30 split between social / affordable rented and intermediate. The additional 10% (beyond the policy requirement up to 45%) would be shared ownership. The overall housing tenure mix is outlined below:

Table 6.1 Housing Tenure Mix

	Market	Social/Affordable Rented	Intermediate	Total
No. Dwellings	44	20	16	80
% Dwellings	55%	24.5%	20.5%	100%

6.3 Providing Members considered the enhanced affordable housing offer to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, the provision of affordable housing beyond the policy requirement of 35% could be secured via a Section 106 legal agreement.

6.4 The application is accompanied by a plan (ref. 23054-04-6 Rev B) showing the proposed site access point from Broadmead opposite the cul-de-sac of Nos. 19-45 Broadmead. The site would be served by the single vehicular access point from the public highway. An additional plan (ref. 23054-04-7 Rev B) identifies off-site highway improvement works comprising alteration of the Rectory Road/Broadmead junction and installation of a 2m footway on the east side of Rectory Road between that junction and Chalky Road.

6.5 A series of indicative site plans show how a development of 80 dwellings could be configured:

- P003 and P004 Indicative site layouts
- P005 Indicative site layout proposal – affordability
- P006 Indicative site layout proposal – unit types

- P007 Indicative pavements and roads proposals
- P008 Indicative parking, refuse and cycle strategy proposal
- P009 Indicative boundary treatment plan proposal

6.6 These illustrative drawings are submitted for purely illustrative purposes only. They represent one way in which the development could come forward at the subsequent Reserved Matters stage and intend to show how the detailed design of the site could be configured in an acceptable way to provide 80 dwellings.

6.7 The illustrative drawings show the site could be developed to provide detached bungalows along Broadmead and detached and semi-detached houses throughout the rest of the site. A total of six house types are shown, ranging from 2-bed semi-detached houses through to 4-bed detached houses. The layout shows dwellings set back from the western boundary and existing foul sewer. The illustrative proposals show how a mix of market and affordable dwellings (35%) could be provided on site. Two clusters of affordable rented dwellings are identified within the centre of the site and shared ownership dwellings are dispersed in the west, south and north of the site. Internal access is shown via a central circulatory road.

6.8 Parking is generally shown on-plot to the front or side of dwellings. A parking court is provided within the centre of the site. The illustrative proposals show three areas of public open space within the site:

1. a 7,760sq.m area along the south eastern boundary adjacent to Chalky Road and within the area of surface water flood risk;
2. a central open space of 2,673sq.m; and
3. an area of 2,554sq.m in the north of the site providing links to the adjacent SANG site and existing bridleway.

6.9 In addition, 27 allotments are identified within the north west corner of the site.

6.10 The site lies outside but adjacent to the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) and Dorset AONB. It lies within 5km of protected heathlands, within a mineral safeguarding area, within the river and nutrient catchment area of Poole Harbour and within a groundwater source protection zone. The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding from river and sea sources) but has an elevated risk of groundwater flooding (+75%). Parts of the southeast of the site adjacent to properties along Chalky Lane also have an elevated risk of flooding from surface water (1 in 30yr, 1 in 100yr and 1 in 1,000 year risk level).

6.11 The site does not fall within a Conservation Area. The closest listed buildings are located approximately 180-200m to the east of the site within the historic core of Broadmayne (various buildings) and the northern end of Bramble Drove (Historic England ref. 1323944). A Scheduled Ancient Monument is located approximately 500m north at Little Mayne Farm (Historic England ref. 1002697). The heritage assets are not visible from the application site. Representations note the concrete section of Rectory Road has historical importance regarding the D-Day landings where it was used for equipment maintenance and the refuelling and parking of heavy vehicles. It has been considered a Non-Designated Heritage Asset for assessment purposes.

6.12 The site lies predominantly within the Chalk Valley and Downland Landscape Character Area which extends to the north west. A central part of the site falls within the Heath/Farmland Mosaic Landscape Character Area which extends to the east and incorporates the historic core of Broadmayne. Nevertheless, the site has a somewhat suburban, countryside-edge character owing to its topography and presence of dwellings on three sides.

7.0 Relevant Planning History

7.1 The relevant planning history for the site is summarised in the table below.

7.2 The most relevant planning history relates to an outline planning application (all matters reserved) submitted in 2014 for redevelopment of the eastern part of the site for up to 30 dwellings together with creation of new vehicular and pedestrian access from Broadmead (WD/D/14/002343). The illustrative drawing submitted with the application showed housing in the northern part of the site with public amenity space provided to the south adjacent to Littlemead. The application was refused in March 2015 for four reasons. In summary:

1. Highway safety impacts on the A352/Rectory Road junction;
2. Adverse impacts on below-ground archaeology;
3. Adverse impacts on Dorset Heathlands; and
4. Affordable housing provision.

7.3 At the time of the decision, the Local Planning Authority could not demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply (5YHLS) meaning the presumption in favour of sustainable development was engaged.

7.4 The historic applications of the 1980s include part of the current planning application site together with adjacent land to the north.

7.5 The live application for change of use of land to the north to provide a SANG (P/FUL/2021/05255) relates to the current outline planning application and is proposed in order to mitigate impacts on Dorset Heathlands.

Table 7.1 Relevant Planning History

Application No.	Proposal	Decision	Date
P/FUL/2021/05255	Change of use of agricultural land to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and temporary formation of a construction haul road	Under consideration	N/A
WD/D/14/002343	Residential development of land for up to 30 dwellings and formation of new vehicular and pedestrian access	Refused	11 March 2015

1/E/85/000573	Develop land by the erection of 35 houses and garages, construct estate road	Refused	9 October 1985
1/E/83/000427	Develop land for residential purposes and construct estate roads	Refused	28 February 1984

8.0 List of Constraints

Land Outside Defined Development Boundary

Dorset Heath Designation Buffer 5km

Landscape Character Areas: Open Chalk Downland (South Dorset Downs) and Heath Farmland Mosaic (Crossways Gravel Plateau)

Adjacent to Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to the west

Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Area

Groundwater Source Protection Areas

Poole Harbour Nutrient Catchment Area; Poole Harbour

Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (Extent 1 in 30/100/1000) – within the southern part of the site

Areas Susceptible to Groundwater Flooding; Clearwater (+75%)

SSSI impact risk zone and 5k buffers (Various)

Medium pressure gas pipeline 25m or less from Medium Pressure Pipelines – along the western boundary of the site

Rights of Way: to the north of the site

9.0 Consultations

9.0 There have been three rounds of public consultation on the planning application. The first consultation was undertaken following validation of the application in December 2021. At that stage, the application related to “up to 90 residential units”.

9.1 Following the first round of consultation, the Applicant submitted amended plans and supporting documents. The revised proposal included the reduction in housing to “up to 80 residential units”. The second round of consultation took place between April-May 2022. The Applicant subsequently advised of the intention to provide all housing as affordable housing and submitted a series of new and amended documents. A third round of consultation was undertaken between October-

November 2022. The applicant subsequently increased the provision of affordable housing from 35% to 45%. No further public consultation was undertaken in respect of this change.

9.2 Alongside the public consultations the Applicant has been liaising with Natural England in respect of nutrient neutrality and the proposed off-site mitigation proposed. This has resulted in some delay in reporting the application to planning committee due to the need to undertake the necessary Habitat Regulations Assessment.

9.3 All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website. A summary is provided below.

Consultees

Natural England

9.4 Natural England's consultation response confirms no objection in principle subject to the mitigation measures in respect of the SANG, SAMM and nutrient neutrality being secured in perpetuity. The response notes further details are required to comply with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Natural England note and support the comments of the AONB Team.

9.5 Following review of Dorset Council's Habitat Regulations Assessment, Natural England advised they concur with the assessment conclusions, provided that all mitigation measures including the ongoing SANG management arrangements and associated costs and the agreed nutrient mitigation measures are appropriately secured in any permission given.

Historic England

9.6 Historic England's consultation response confirms Historic England does not wish to offer any comments on the application. Historic England recommend the views of Dorset Council's conservation and archaeological advisors are sought.

Wessex Water

9.7 The response from Wessex Water confirms the location of Wessex Water assets within the Application Site and easement requirements for habitable buildings, landscaping, and drainage to be located sufficient distance away. It notes sewers and water mains must remain located in highway or public open space as Wessex Water requires unrestricted access for maintenance and repair. The response acknowledges the application is submitted in outline application and places a "holding objection on the layout" until the Applicant has demonstrated how the easements will be accommodated.

9.8 The response notes the proposed surface water drainage strategy and states no surface water runoff or land drainage will be accepted into the public foul sewer.

Southern Gas Networks (SGN) – No comments received.

Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) – No comments received.

Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership

9.9 The response from Dorset AONB Partnership notes the location of the dwellings outside of the AONB boundary. The response acknowledges Dorset Council was unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and that the 'tilted balance' in favour of sustainable development did not apply in a number of sensitive locations, including AONBs.

9.10 Dorset AONB Partnership note guidance within the NPPF and draw attention to what is defined as a 'major' application in the context of NPPF Para. 177 is a matter for the planning authority to evaluate. The response requests the Local Planning Authority to consider whether the proposal could constitute major development within the AONB given the link between the residential element (outside the AONB) and SANG (within the AONB). This assessment is dependent on whether there is a major effect on the character and appearance of the designated areas.

9.11 The response considers the introduction of housing within the site *"is not considered likely to inherently impact upon the rural character of land within the designated area"*. It explains this is due to the location of housing outside the AONB, interface with existing residential areas to the east, south and west and topographic screening of the site. The response highlights key mitigation measures in the form of scale, materials, lighting and planting will need to be carefully designed.

9.12 Dorset AONB Partnership comment on the Landscape Appraisal (see assessment section below) and note the layout, scale and landscaping are important requirements which need further consideration. In respect of density, the response defers to Dorset Council's urban design and landscape consultees.

Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue

9.13 Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue note the requirement to meet Building Regulations requirements and draws attention to key recommendations to improve safety and reduce property loss in the event of fire. The response highlights the need to provide access and facilities for fire services and to provide water supplies for firefighting.

Dorset Police - Crime Prevention Design Engineers – No comments received.

Planning Policy

9.14 The Planning Policy Team identify the relevant policies for the site and comment on the principle of development, housing land supply and the 'major development test' for development within AONB.

9.15 Policy SUS2 restricts development outside DDBs to a limited range of uses including market housing through the re-use of existing rural buildings or affordable housing as exception sites. Given the related SANG site falls within AONB, the response recommends consideration is given to whether the combined residential and SANG proposals constitute 'major development' under Para. 177 of the NPPF.

9.16 Following the submission of evidence challenging the council's stated 5YHLS position, the Planning Policy Team provided an updated response drawing attention to the need to assess the proposals against Policy HOUS2 (affordable housing exception sites) and the NPPF (Para. 78). The Planning Policy Team reiterated that the council is able to demonstrate a 5YHLS and has a Housing Delivery Test result of 114% for the plan area.

9.17 Following the intention to provide 100% affordable housing, the Planning Policy Team commented to note the decision maker will need to be satisfied that the proposal qualifies as an affordable housing exception site by meeting all of the criteria detailed at Policy HOUS2 to be acceptable in principle. They also noted assessment under Para. 78 of the NPPF would be required.

Housing Enabling Team

9.18 The Housing Enabling Team note community engagement has indicated to the applicant that 2-3 bedroom dwellings are desired locally. The response confirms the affordable housing provision (35%) is policy compliant although any additional affordable housing would be welcomed.

9.19 It is desirable that affordable housing 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 of housing that is 'tenure neutral'.

9.20 The housing register demonstrates that there is a significant need for quality affordable family housing with a high demand for a range of dwelling sizes and tenures which this development will assist in meeting.

9.21 The Housing Enabling Team did not provide a further consultation response following confirmation by the applicant that they intend to provide all housing as affordable.

Landscape

9.22 The Landscape Officer provided comments to the initial consultation and second consultation. The latest comments maintain the objection to the proposal and request further information.

9.23 The Landscape Officer has no in-principle objection to development on the site. However, whilst the quantum of development has been reduced from 90 to 80 dwellings, the indicative layout does not demonstrate that this scale of development can be appropriately accommodated on site.

9.24 The density and indicative layout does not comply with Policy ENV 12: “i) *Development will achieve a high quality of sustainable and inclusive design. It will only be permitted where it complies with national technical standards and where the siting, alignment, design, scale, mass, and materials used complements and respects the character of the surrounding area or would actively improve legibility or reinforce the sense of place.*”

9.25 The main issues are summarised as follows:

1. Housing density and dominance of street parking and the parking courtyard has a suburban character inappropriate in the area.
2. The layout does not adequately address the easement along NW/SE border. Drainage requirements may reduce the housing capacity of the site.
3. Landscape Strategy - Inadequate strategic mitigation particularly to NW/SE/NE boundary Landscape mitigation is unclear. Proposal is over-reliant on off-site trees for mitigation.
4. The allotment provision remains squeezed into the site detached from the community and with insufficient parking. Suggest relocating the allotments close to the SANG carpark.
5. Note potential for pleasant pedestrian route along the western boundary subject to significant rearrangement of the layout.
6. Play provision has not been provided. A Locally Equipped Area for Play is required in the area. Provision may reduce the housing capacity of the site.
7. The illustrative masterplan does not demonstrate that the quantum of 80 dwellings can be accommodated appropriately.

9.25 The response notes a Landscape Management Plan would be required at Reserved Matters stage that relates specifically to landscape strategy objectives and the landscape maintenance.

9.26 The Landscape Officer further notes the updated LVA (May 2022) does not assess the worst case scenario given it contains a winter view from View Point (VP)

1 within the site only, and not the VP3 highlighted in the officer's earlier objection. Nevertheless, the Landscape Officer considers VP3 would afford more open view of the site as the existing mature trees are deciduous and notes the LVA states the level of effect on visual amenity as a result of the development from VP3 is major/moderate in year 1 and moderate in year 10.

Urban Design

9.27 The Urban Design Officer's comments on the latest proposals note that although there are aspects of the illustrative layout that should not be carried through to the Reserved Matters stage, the reduction in density from 90 to 80 dwellings would allow these issues to be overcome at a more detailed design phase.

9.28 The Urban Design Officer makes a number of comments on the illustrative proposals acknowledging that a number of the issues raised are not for detailed consideration at this outline planning stage but will need to be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage:

1. The provision of single storey dwellings along the north eastern boundary responds to the character of Broadmead.
2. Revised illustrative proposal shows increased natural surveillance from dwellings towards footpaths. Footpath along the S/SW boundary has been re-routed as recommended. The provision of a pedestrian network with direct and well-surveyed links throughout the site would be a key consideration for the Reserved Matters.
3. The orientation of dwellings adjacent to open spaces are generally shown to be fronting towards these areas. In instances where this isn't the case, the layout could be tweaked at a more detailed design stage to achieve this. Some dwellings should be re-orientated to face the street.
4. Support Landscape Officer's comments (summarised above) that the allotments should be relocated.
5. Request Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) is provided and included within the illustrative plans to demonstrate Fields In Trust guidance is met.
6. Major concerns with public open space proposed as the buffer between the site and existing housing at Martel Close. Recommend this part of the site is reconfigured to back development onto the boundary using plots with deep rear gardens to utilise the foul sewer easement. Suggest larger detached and some semi-detached dwellings would better reflect the character of the wider area in line with Martel Close.

7. Boundaries have been significantly improved. SANG boundary could be optimised at the Reserved Matters stage to allow more dwellings to front toward the SANG with less visible plot boundaries.
8. Introduction of flint/brick to the materials palette is a welcome addition reflective of Broadmayne.
9. Illustrative layout shows parking provision could be sufficiently accommodated subject to detailed design. Garages to bungalows facing Broadmead supported.

Conservation Officer

9.29 No objection. The proposals are not considered to have the potential to affect the significance of any built designated heritage assets owing to distance and/or substantial intervening development.

Natural Environment Team (NET)

9.30 NET provided a Certificate of Approval in respect of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) on 8 February 2022. The certificate confirms the LEMP adequately addresses the impact on biodiversity. The response notes the LEMP is considered to provide reasonable ecological mitigating and enhancement measures to meet the NERC Act 2006 duty. NET request the full implementation of the LEMP is secured by planning condition.

9.31 The response recommends consultation with Dorset AONB Partnership and Natural England. It also notes the proximity to European Wildlife Sites, SSSI and within 5km of designated heathland.

Highways

9.32 On balance, when judged against the parameters of the NPPF, given the proposed highway alterations/mitigation measures and the analysis of the Chalky Road/A352 junction, the Highway Authority has no objection subject to planning conditions related to: estate road construction; visibility splays; off-site highway works; and construction traffic management plan.

9.33 The proposed access points to the residential development and the SANG car park have sufficient vehicular visibility provision and comply with local and government guidance. The position of the accesses within the highway and in relation to other highway features is acceptable. The width of the access is compliant and allows appropriate refuse vehicle access.

9.34 As with previous applications, the Highway Authority remain concerned regarding any proposals that would see an intensification of use of the Rectory

Road/A352 junction due to the existing substandard vehicular visibility splays available. The current application has acknowledged this concern and seeks to mitigate it through alterations and improvements to the public highway in the vicinity of the site. The proposed alterations and improvements are as follows:

- No entry for vehicles along Rectory Road northbound of the junction with Conway Drive - retaining access southbound from the A352 into Rectory Road
- Alteration to the arrangement and priority of the Broadmead / Rectory Road junction, including improved pedestrian facilities
- Alterations to the Rectory Road/Chalky Road junction - providing an improved pedestrian environment and informal crossing point with tactile paving
- Associated pedestrian improvements - tactile paving provision at St Martins Close; providing the missing sections of footway along Chalky Road, from its junction with the A352 to that of Rectory Road
- Access only signage to Bramble Drove, which is a private road

9.35 Junction analysis of the Chalky Road/A352 junction has been undertaken and shows that the junction currently operates well within capacity. The analysis goes on to show that the additional traffic expected to be associated with the proposed development and that created by the proposed restriction of exiting traffic from the Rectory Road/A352 junction can be comfortably accommodated. This analysis has been tested at current levels and using forecast growth figures (TEMPRO Growth Rates), a recognised methodology which is a standard practice and is considered robust. Visibility at the junction is in excess of standard, given the speed limit of the road. With the above in mind, it is considered that the junction is compliant with Department for Transport standards and has sufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in traffic associated with the proposal.

Lead Local Flood Authority

9.36 No in-principle objection to the proposed scheme or conceptual drainage strategy subject to the pre-commencement planning conditions in respect of detailed design and maintenance.

Minerals and Waste Policy

9.37 There is potential for sand and gravel under part of the site falling within the Mineral Safeguarding Area as designated by Policy SG1 of the Minerals Strategy 2014. It is expected that it may be possible for some mineral to be removed from the site and re-used in some capacity within the housing site should permission be granted. Planning condition seeking re-use of sand and gravels recommended.

Building Control West Team

9.38 Building Control raise no objection and note Building Regulations Approval will be required.

Dorset Waste Partnership – No comments received.

Trees – No comments received.

Economic Development and Tourism – No comments received.

Environmental Services – Protection

9.39 Dorset Council's Environmental Health team recommend planning conditions in respect of land contamination.

Archaeology

9.40 Following liaison with the Applicant's archaeological consultant, and noting the potential for archaeological remains on the site, the council's archaeologist raises no objection subject to conditions.

Libraries – No comments received.

Street Lighting Team

9.41 Any of the new estate being proposed for adoptable as public highway must be lit, as per Dorset Council Street Lighting Policy POLS900, for areas where most roads are already lit. Mature tree canopy sizes should be plotted to allow further assessment of street lighting compatibility.

9.42 The shared surface areas (roads without any pavements) provide no safe locations for street lighting to be installed. Safety legislation requires a minimum separation of vehicles from highway electrical apparatus which, for lighting columns, is taken as 800mm from a full height kerb. These necessary kerbed and raised islands around each light will reduce the useable width of the highway significantly and conflict with pedestrians and vehicle movements.

9.43 The use of a vertical traffic calming features will require permanent all-night street lighting, to comply with the Road Hump Regulations, rather than part night street lighting which would otherwise apply to the estate if horizontal or other measures were employed.

Adult social care – No Comments received.

Public Rights of Way Strategic Access Development

9.44 The Strategic Outdoor Access Development Officer provided a response in respect of PRow and countryside access matters. The Officer notes PRow S9/15 through the SANG site would be affected by the development and its character would change from crossing an open field to running adjacent to the residential development. The response requests further details and clarifications and notes that increased footfall and cycling on Bridleway 19/15 and the wider PRow network should be considered to ensure it functions effectively as a bridleway and better integrates with the development. Concerns raised with construction of the haul road across the PRow and request planning conditions to mitigate impacts.

Broadmayne Parish Council

9.45 Broadmayne Parish Council provided objections at all consultation stages. The latest response maintains the objection and states the revised proposal (100% affordable) would exacerbate many of the issues identified within the earlier objections. In summary, the objections raise the following points:

1. Development would be out of scale with Broadmayne and would conflict with Policy SUS2 as a large scale residential development outside the DDB;
2. 80 affordable dwellings would be wholly inappropriate for the rural location given the lack of local employment, healthcare, retail and community facilities within the village coupled with the poor bus service;
3. The proposal would not qualify as an affordable housing exception site because only 35% of dwellings would be affordable, no assessment of local needs has been carried out and the scheme is not of a character, scale and design appropriate to the location;
4. Concerns with highway impacts, including: underestimation of impacts; lack of safe cycling routes; highway safety concerns with additional traffic; junction capacity at Chalky Road/A352; impacts of making Rectory Road one-way; effectiveness of 'access only' signage on Bramble Drove; loss of on-street parking areas; insufficient parking provision for residents; adverse impacts on road surfacing; conflict with Policy COM7 and the NPPF (Paras. 105 and 112);
5. Planning history shows a series of refused developments and should not be relied upon to justify the proposed development;
6. Adverse impacts on the character of Broadmayne and nearby ANOB;
7. Adverse amenity impacts through loss of outlook, overbearing impact and external lighting;

8. Loss of concrete strip along Rectory Road which has historic significance preceding D-Day when the village hosted many US military personnel;
9. Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land; and
10. Flooding and surface water drainage concerns.

Winterborne and Broadmayne Ward Councillors – Roland Tarr

9.46 Request that the applications be considered by Planning Committee. Note support to Broadmayne Parish Council’s comments and states the Local Plan should be adhered to given Broadmayne is a small village adjoining the Dorset AONB. The village Infrastructure for active travel across the village and to places of education and work such as Dorchester is currently unsatisfactory and dangerous and a certain amount of public and/or private investment, goodwill and discussion with other stakeholders in the area would be required to rectify this problem.

West Knighton Parish Council – No comments received.

Whitcombe Parish Council – No comments received.

Representations Received

9.47 At the time of writing a total of 169 representations have been received. Of these 144 comprise objections, 13 make comments and 12 support the application. It should be noted that in a number of instances multiple representations have been submitted by the same residents. These representations have been taken into account fully and carefully in assessing the proposal. Comments received were wide-ranging. In summary, the following key themes of the representations are as follows:

Topic	Comments
Comments of Support	
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development would provide affordable housing in an area of high prices. - Affordable housing is much needed. - Some shared ownership homes should be ring-fenced for applicants with a village connection. - Affordable housing supported subject to: increasing the low-cost element to 50%; ensuring the development is viable; and viability review mechanisms - Bungalows will provide suitable housing for an aging population and allow local people to stay local.
Socio-Economic Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New houses will support facilities within the village and allow them to grow and thrive. - Proposals will attract young people to village.

Renewable energy	- Support renewable energy generation.
Comments of Objection	
Principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development is outside of the DDB. - Brownfield sites should be prioritised before greenfield. - Site is not allocated for development. - Development is not required. - Other locations within the village would be more appropriate for village expansion. - Proposal is not a small scale rural exception site. - Loss of best and most versatile productive farmland. - Loss of open land. - Site is not a sustainable location due to limited local services, employment opportunities and poor public transport provision.
AONB	- Increased urbanisation within the setting of the AONB will harm the AONB.
Local character and visual amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harm to village character through development of an urban housing estate disproportionate to the scale of the village. - Harm to visual amenity from existing open views along Broadmead and form surrounding houses. - Development would be out of character with dwellings along Martel Close, a number of which are chalet bungalows and bungalows. - Development would not be in harmony with adjacent properties. - Detrimental impacts on visual, physical and social character of village. - Proposals would fundamentally change the character from rural to suburban.
Scale and density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 90 dwellings is too dense for a village of c. 600 dwellings. - 15-20% increase in the number of dwellings would totally alter village character and would be a disproportionately large increase to a small village. - Density would far exceed that in Martel Close (10dph) or Broadmead (13dph). - Broadmayne is only suitable for small-scale in-fill development. - Concern design and materials would be out of keeping with village. Should be similar to properties in Martel Close and Broadmead (reconstituted stone).
Housing (including affordable housing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate assurances on affordable housing. - Houses will be unaffordable to young families of Broadmayne. - Concerns housing would provide second homes, holiday lets and/or investment properties rather than first homes. - Housing will not meet local needs. - Absence of social housing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Percentage of homes should be safeguarded for locals during an initial sales period. - Mixed tenure development on a smaller scale would be far more appropriate to maintain the character of Broadmayne. - Proposal for 100% affordable housing would not create a mixed and balanced community.
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concrete section in Rectory Road proposed to be removed would destroy the historical importance regarding D Day. - Development would harm archaeology.
Residential amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased noise and disruption from traffic. - Major disruption during construction phase. - Loss of privacy to residents of Martel Close and Littlemead. - Overshadowing of existing homes. - Harm to peaceful enjoyment and private family life (Human Rights Act). - Proposals would result in a loss of property value.
Highway safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rectory Road/A352 junction is substandard and has poor visibility. Existing safety concerns would be exacerbated. - Rectory Road/Chalky Road has no footpath or streetlighting and has poor visibility. Additional traffic causes pedestrian safety concerns. - Bramble Drove and Bramble Drove/A352 junction is not suitable. - Rectory Road / Broadmead junction is dangerous and not wide enough to support increase in traffic. - Street parking would restrict visibility splays. - Absence of footpaths throughout village (inc. Rectory Road) causes pedestrian safety concerns due to additional traffic. - Increased traffic would be a danger to vulnerable road users, including children, elderly, cyclists and horse riders. - Street lighting needs to be considered and provided along rectory road.
Highways (including public transport and sustainable travel)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased traffic from dwellings and users of SANG. - Highway impacts will be severe. - Chalky Road/A352 junction is too busy. - Impacts have been underestimated due to surveys during Covid lockdowns. - Temporary haul road should be made permanent and used by residents for main access. This would relieve pressure of village roads. - Bus service improvements should be secured and funded by the developer. Existing provision is poor. - Inadequate provision of cycle routes.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased parking on street would cause parking stress. - Parking should be provided for allotments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate parking for dwellings. - Proposals would reduce existing on street parking.
Biodiversity and trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harm to wildlife through loss of habitat, including: hares, owls, bats, foxes, voles, hedgehogs, deer and reptiles. - Loss of trees caused by construction of haul road. - Tree report inaccurately plots existing trees. - Adverse impacts on Poole Harbour through additional nutrient loading. - Some proposed tree species would be unsuitable for the calcareous soils.
Flood risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing flooding issue at Rectory Road/Broadmead needs to be fully addressed. - Proposal would make existing flooding issues worse and increase flood risk to adjacent homes especially in Knights Mayne.
Air quality and noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased air pollution and noise caused by increased traffic and construction works.
Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Light pollution caused by street lighting. - Loss of dark sky environment.
Community Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pressure on health and leisure facilities and public services (education, police, healthcare and council services). - Existing facilities within village are limited. There isn't a doctors surgery or dentist within the village. - Loss of amenity provided by bench immediately opposite the proposed entrance to the estate.
Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development could adversely affect existing water mains through vibrations. - Transformer sub-station at Rectory Road could be liable to damage in the event of an accident at the Rectory Road/Broadmead junction. - Waste water sewage system are inadequate and should be upgraded.
Climate Change and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased carbon emissions due to urbanisation and use of vehicle movements. - Proposals won't tackle the climate emergency declared by Dorset Council. - Commitment to carbon neutral dwellings is supported. - Development on greenfield site is not appropriate.
Socio-Economic Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits would be limited.
Emerging Dorset Local Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal does not comply with emerging new Local Plan.

Land Ownership	- Site boundary includes land and trees within the rear gardens of properties along Martel Close.
----------------	---

10.0 Relevant Policies

Development Plan

s38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of planning applications must be in accordance with the development plan unless material circumstances indicate otherwise. The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) (LP) Policies

- INT1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- ENV1 - Landscape, seascape & sites of other geological interest
- ENV2 - Wildlife and habitats
- ENV3 - Green infrastructure network
- ENV4 - Heritage assets
- ENV5 - Flood risk
- ENV8 - Agricultural land and farming resilience
- ENV9 - Pollution and Contaminated Land
- ENV10 - The landscape and townscape setting
- ENV11 - The pattern of streets and spaces
- ENV12 - The design and positioning of buildings
- ENV13 - Achieving high levels of environmental performance
- ENV15 - Efficient and appropriate use of land
- ENV 16 - Amenity
- SUS1 - The level of economic and housing growth
- SUS2 - Distribution of development
- HOUS1 - Affordable housing
- HOUS2 - Affordable housing exception sites
- HOUS3 - Open market housing mix
- HOUS4 - Development of flats, hostels and houses in multiple occupation
- COM1 - Making sure new development makes suitable provision of community infrastructure
- COM7 - Creating a safe & efficient transport network
- COM9 - Parking standards in new development
- COM10 - The provision of utilities service infrastructure

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy (2014)

- SG1 - Mineral Safeguarding Area

Other Material Considerations

Emerging Dorset Council Local Plan

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.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4. Decision-making: 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.
- Section 8 'Promoting healthy and safe communities' aims to make places healthy, inclusive and safe.
- Section 9 'Promoting sustainable transport' requires appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be taken up, given the type of development and its location, safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users, the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code 46 and any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

- Section 11 ‘Making effective use of land’. Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.
- Section 12 ‘Achieving well designed places.’
 Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience (para 30).
- Section 14 ‘Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change’. The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.
- 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). Paragraphs 179-182 set out how biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.

Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance

Dorset AONB Landscape Character Assessment

Dorset AONB Management Plan 2019-2024

Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 SPD (2006)

Dorset Heathlands Interim Air Quality Strategy (2021)

Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD (2017)

Dorset Waste Storage, Collection, and Management – Guidance notes for residential developments (2020)

West Dorset Planning Obligations SPD (2010)

West Dorset Design & Sustainable Development Planning Guidelines (2009)

West Dorset Landscape Character Assessment (2009)

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

12.1 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.

12.2 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.

- Access; arrangements can be made to ensure people with disabilities or mobility impairments or pushing buggies can be accommodated (off road footpath links and crossing points). There will be improved footpath links.
- Officers have not identified any specific impacts arising from the development on those persons with protected characteristics.

13.0 Financial benefits

What	Amount / value
Material Considerations	
Total housing	Up to 80 dwellings
Affordable housing	Minimum 45% (36 dwellings based on maximum of 80 dwellings)
Market housing	Maximum of 55% (52 dwellings based on maximum of 80 dwellings)
Quantum of open space and play space, based on indicative proposals and associated SANG application.	- SANG: 8.9ha - Public open space within residential parcel: 12,985sq.m (including LEAP)

	- 400sq.m Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) in accordance with Fields In Trust Guidance
Implementation of Landscape Environment Management Plan	A wide range of biodiversity and landscape enhancements which would deliver biodiversity net gains
Non-Material Considerations	
Council Tax	According to value of each property
New Homes Bonus	A proportion of provisional 2023/24 allocation of £1,824,767
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)	According to CIL Regulations and in line with West Dorset CIL Charging Schedule.

14.0 Climate Implications

14.1 The proposal would lead to additional CO2 emissions from construction of the dwellings and from the activities of future residents.

14.2 The construction phase would include the release of CO2 emissions from construction workers vehicles during the construction process. CO2 emission would be produced as a result of the production and transportation of the building materials and during the construction process.

14.3 This has to be balanced against the benefits of providing housing in a moderately sustainable location and should be offset against factors including the provision of electric car charging and the dwellings being reasonably energy efficient as required by Building Regulations.

14.4 Under the council's current Validation Checklist (updated 12 December 2022), a Sustainability Statement demonstrating how sustainable design and construction have been addressed, including reducing energy consumption and carbon emissions taking into account adaptation to climate change would be required at the Reserved Matters stage.

15.0 Planning Assessment

Principle of development

Redevelopment outside of the DDB

15.1 The site is currently in arable agricultural use. It adjoins the DDB of Broadmayne on three sides to the east, south and west. Although outside of the DDB, the site is well-related to the surrounding settlement of Broadmayne.

15.2 Policy SUS2 of the Local Plan sets the spatial strategy confirming a greater proportion of development will be distributed to larger and more sustainable settlements. Broadmayne falls within the third tier of the settlement hierarchy and is one of the larger villages wherein Policy SUS2 advises development should take place at an appropriate scale to the size of the settlement. The proposed development of up to 80 homes would be disproportionate to the size of the

settlement representing around a 14% uplift in the existing number of households within the village (approximately 560).

15.3 Policy SUS2 confirms development will be strictly controlled, having particular regard to the need for the “protection of the countryside and environmental constraints” (assessed below). The stated criteria where development outside DDBs may be permitted include “affordable housing” (bullet 4) and “open market housing through the re-use of existing rural buildings” (bullet 6).

15.4 The Council’s latest published 5 year housing land supply position reflecting the 1 April 2022 base date is 5.34 years. In a recent appeal decision (APP/D1265/W/22/3291668) an Inspector considered that the Council had a 5.25 year supply, bearing in mind the evidence that was presented to them earlier in 2023 before the publication of the 1 April 2022 base date position. However, the Inspector in that same decision stated that for a number of reasons the supply may be greater than 5.25 years but less than that stated by the Council at the time of the appeal which was 5.75 years. The fact that the Council stated a position of 5.34 years in April this year is considered to be consistent with the Inspector’s statement that supply could be greater than 5.25 but less than 5.75 years and as such the position remains at 5.34 years supply as of the 1 April 2022 base date. Given the former West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland area is currently able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and meet the Housing Delivery Test, the proposal for a mixed market and affordable development is not acceptable in principle.

15.5 Whilst the provision of market housing on a greenfield site does not comply with Policy SUS2, the site is adjacent to the DDB and is a moderately sustainable location. It is well-related to Broadmayne within walking distance of a range of facilities, including the village hall, shop and public house. Broadmayne First School is located approximately 1.1km to the north. It is also served by limited bus services into Dorchester, which takes 10 minutes. The increased number of households would help to support the limited local facilities within the village. These factors would not overcome the scale of development which would be disproportionate to the size of Broadmayne.

15.6 Notwithstanding the restrictive policy basis for market housing, the site was considered in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2021) and found to be a “suitable site with potential as an affordable housing exception site subject to identified need”. The applicant and their housing association partner (Abri) has confirmed the *intention* to deliver 100% affordable housing on the site. Homes England corroborates this intention and confirms Abri secured a total grant allocation of £250m to deliver over 3,000 new affordable homes by March 2028. Homes England has confirmed the site is included in Abri’s Strategic Partnership development pipeline.

15.7 Policy HOUS2 of the Local Plan allows for the provision of affordable homes through ‘exception sites’ i.e. affordable housing on sites that would not normally be granted planning permission for open market housing. It allows for small sites adjoining DDBs to provide 100% affordable housing without a fundamental policy objection. Affordable homes on such sites should remain available to meet local housing needs in perpetuity and appropriate arrangements to ensure this will be

expected. The policy requires that the scheme is of a character, scale and design appropriate to the location (assessed in sections below). To avoid an unbalanced community mix, large sites are not encouraged through the exception site approach.

15.8 The NPPF (Para. 78) sets out that Local Planning Authorities should support opportunities to bring forward rural exceptions sites that will provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs. The NPPF defines rural exception sites as *“small sites used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normally be used for housing. Rural exception sites seek to address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection...”*

15.9 The proposal represents a large scale site for housing that would not be of a character and scale appropriate to the location. That would remain if all housing were secured and delivered as affordable. This would not fall within the provision of Policy HOUS2 or NPPF (Para. 78). At up to 80 dwellings with the majority served via one access point there are concerns such an approach would not create a mixed and balanced community. Were 100% affordable housing to be secured, the proposal would not be acceptable as an affordable housing exception site.

15.10 The outline application proposes that 45% affordable housing is secured via a Section 106 Agreement. The +10% increase from the policy requirement of 35% has been proposed by the applicant to seek to improve the benefits of the proposal. The intention to provide 100% affordable housing is afforded very limited weight in the decision-making process as the applicant advises it cannot be secured due to funding requirements. The proposal is therefore assessed as a mixed-tenure development. The intention to provide 100% affordable housing has however been assessed and also found not to be acceptable in principle.

15.11 On the basis of the 45% affordable housing proposed to be secured by way of a planning obligation, the proposal is considered unacceptable in principle and would represent a disproportionate expansion compared to the scale of Broadmayne in conflict with Policy SUS2. Nevertheless, the additional +10% affordable housing provision is a significant planning benefit weighed in the planning balance.

Loss of Agricultural Land

15.12 Policy ENV8 seeks to steer built development towards areas of poorer quality land where it is available. The NPPF (Para. 174) notes decisions should enhance the natural and local environment, including by recognising the wider benefits from natural capital, including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. It further states in reference to plan making that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality (Footnote 58).

15.13 A number of objections raise concerns with the loss of agricultural land and highlight concerns with food security. The site is currently in arable agricultural use and is assessed as comprising approximately 30% Grade 2 (very good) and 70% Grade 3a (good) agricultural land. The entirety of the 4.7ha site therefore comprises best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV). The proposals would result in the

loss of 4.7ha of agricultural land and the associated economic and food security benefits associated with food production.

15.14 The submitted Agricultural Land Classification Report makes the case that there are no obvious areas of poorer quality agricultural land on the periphery of Broadmayne and therefore any expansion of Broadmayne would result in the loss of some BMV. This argument is accepted. However, given the council is able to demonstrate a 5YHLS and large scale expansion of Broadmayne does not form part of the strategy, there is considered to be sufficient housing land available to negate the need to develop the site for housing. The loss of the land therefore conflicts with Policy ENV8 of the Local Plan and the clear preference of the NPPF.

15.15 The proposed loss of BMV would result in the loss of the moderate natural capital and associated economic and food security benefits. These are considered in the overall planning balance.

Access, highways and highway safety

15.16 The proposal includes a single means of access serving the residential development from Broadmead. The Highway Authority considers that the proposed access provides sufficient vehicular visibility, is a compliant width to accommodate refuse vehicles and is otherwise acceptable from a highways perspective.

15.17 A number of objections consider the temporary construction haul road through the SANG site should be made permanent and used as the main access to the development. Such an approach would not be acceptable as it would fail to integrate the site with the surrounding area and would undermine the function of the SANG.

15.18 The Transport Assessment considers the impact of the proposed development on a number of junctions and outlines a series of works to mitigate the highway impacts and ensure highway safety. The assessment is informed by the previous application on the site (WD/D/14/002343) which was refused for a number of reasons including highway safety impacts on the A352/Rectory Road junction. The proposal seeks to address this concern through a series of alterations and improvements to the public highway in the vicinity of the site comprising:

1. No entry for vehicles along Rectory Road northbound of the junction with Conway Drive - retaining access southbound from the A352 into Rectory Road.
2. Alteration to the arrangement and priority of the Broadmead Rectory Road junction, including improved pedestrian facilities.
3. Alterations to the Rectory Road/Chalky Road junction - providing an improved pedestrian environment and informal crossing point with tactile paving.
4. Associated pedestrian improvements - tactile paving provision at St Martins Close; providing the missing sections of footway along Chalky Road, from its junction with the A352 to that of Rectory Road.
5. Access only signage to Bramble Drove, which is a private road.

15.19 The Highways Authority confirms the junction analysis of the Chalky Road/A352 junction has been undertaken and shows that the junction currently operates well within capacity. The analysis within the Transport Assessment shows that the additional traffic expected to be associated with the proposed development

and that created by the proposed restriction of exiting traffic from the Rectory Road/A352 junction can be comfortably accommodated. Visibility at the junction is in excess of standard, given the speed limit of the road. With the above in mind, the Highways Authority considers the junction is compliant with Department for Transport standards and has sufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in traffic associated with the proposal.

15.20 The Highway Authority concludes that, on balance, when judged against the NPPF, it has no objection to the proposed development subject to planning conditions. Subject to these conditions and securing the off-site highway works and Traffic Regulation Order, the proposal is acceptable from a highways perspective and would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or have a severe impact on the road network (NPPF, Para. 111).

Housing mix and affordable housing

15.21 Policy HOUS3 states that residential developments should include a mix in the size, type and affordability of dwellings proposed, taking into account the current range of house types and sizes and likely demand in view of the changing demographics of an area. Policy HOUS1 requires the provision of 35% affordable housing with a 70:30 split between social/affordable rented and intermediate tenures. The affordable housing type, size and mix is expected to address the identified and prioritised housing needs of an area and should be proportionate to the scale and mix of market housing.

15.22 The illustrative proposals include a mix of 2, 3 and 4-bed detached, semi-detached houses and bungalows. The mix is informed by community engagement carried out by the applicant which indicates 2-3 bedroom dwellings are desired locally.

15.23 The illustrative proposal shows 28 dwellings (35%) as affordable of which 19 dwellings (68%) would be provided as affordable rented and 9 dwellings (32%) would be provided as shared ownership. This indicative mix broadly complies with Policy HOUS1. The applicant has since increased the affordable housing offer to 45% and confirmed the additional 10% would be provided as shared ownership. Such additional affordable housing would be a significant benefit of the proposal.

15.24 The Council's Housing Enabling Team's comments note that the housing register demonstrates there is a significant level of recorded housing need for affordable family homes across the area although a variety of dwelling sizes are required across the range of sizes. They conclude the affordable housing provision is policy compliant and welcome any additional affordable housing that could be provided beyond 35%.

15.25 Notwithstanding the proposal for 45% affordable housing, the Planning Statement confirms the intention to provide all housing as affordable and the Affordable Housing Addendum confirms the intention to provide a 50:50 tenure split between affordable rented and shared ownership tenures. Whilst the applicant has provided a clear intention to deliver additional affordable homes, this is afforded very limited weight in the determination of this application given the provision is not committed to and the applicant advises the maximum that can be secured by way of a

planning obligation is 45%. The applicant advises this is due to funding restrictions whereby if additional affordable housing is secured via a Section 106 legal agreement further funding to provide 100% affordable housing would not be available. As noted above, there are concerns that such a large scale affordable housing development would be disproportionate to the size of the village and would not foster a mixed and balanced community.

15.26 Neighbour responses raise concern that the housing would provide second homes, holiday lets and/or investment properties rather than homes for first time buyers. There is no policy basis or material considerations to require the market housing element to be restricted to first time buyers only. Affordable housing would meet the definition of affordable housing within the NPPF as “housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market”. It would therefore provide opportunities for a wide range of occupiers and renters, including those on the Housing Register, first time buyers and families thereby helping to meet local housing need.

15.27 As this is an outline application the precise housing provision has not yet been agreed. A Section 106 agreement would ensure 45% of the eventual number would be for affordable housing at an appropriate mix comprising a minimum of 70% social / affordable rent for 35% with the remainder being shared ownership. Such enhanced affordable housing provision beyond the policy requirement could only be secured if Members considered the additional +10% provision necessary to make the development acceptable due to the benefits of the proposal (including enhanced affordable housing provision) outweighing the disbenefits. Provision of onsite affordable housing +10% above the policy compliant level of affordable housing (to 45%) is a significant benefit weighing in favour of the proposed development.

Impact on AONB setting

15.28 NPPF (Para.176) states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs. Development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas. Para. 177 establishes that planning permission should be refused for ‘major development’ (determined by the decision maker) within AONBs other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.

15.29 The site lies adjacent to the AONB which follows the western boundary of the site including residential properties along Martel Close together with land to the north. Whilst the proposal for residential development falls entirely outside of the AONB, the associated SANG falls partially within the AONB. The SANG is subject to a separate planning application (P/FUL/2021/05255) which would be linked with the residential proposals via a Section 106 agreement.

15.30 For the purposes of NPPF Para. 177, it is relevant to consider whether the combined proposal would represent major development for which exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated. Considering the residential and SANG proposals as a whole, the only development proposed within the AONB comprises approximately 40% of the SANG. The SANG would provide natural open space including landscaping and pedestrian routes. The proposed SANG within the

AONB is not considered to be major development for the purposes of NPPF Para 177. Whilst it would be linked to a residential development of up to 80 dwellings, the site of the proposed dwellings is located outside of the AONB. Accordingly, the exceptional circumstances outlined at NPPF Para. 177 are not engaged and do not need to be demonstrated for either development.

15.31 The applicant has submitted a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) with the application which considers the impact of the proposals on the setting of the AONB. Dorset AONB Partnership consider the development of housing within the site is not likely to inherently impact upon the rural character of land within the designated area. The AONB Partnership explains this is due to the location of housing outside the AONB, interface with existing residential areas to the east, south and west and topographic screening of the site.

15.32 It is noted that the site is well-related to the urban area of Broadmayne and there would be limited visibility of the site from the surrounding AONB. This is evident in the short-range views from Broadmayne and longer-range view from the AONB which show the proposals would be seen in the context of Broadmayne. Due to the location and character of the site, the proposals would not harm the sense of tranquillity and remoteness of the AONB through adverse impacts within its setting.

15.33 Owing to the location of the site outside of the AONB, sloping topography away from the open countryside and AONB and presence of existing dwellings to the east, south and west, it is considered that, subject to appropriate reserved matters submissions, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the AONB and would not harm its special qualities or natural beauty.

Impact on local landscape and village character

15.34 Sections 7 and 15 of the NPPF seek to employ high quality inclusive design which respects, and integrates with, its environment. The Framework seeks to ensure decisions contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting valued landscapes through recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

15.35 In particular, Para 127 of the NPPF seeks, amongst other objectives, to ensure decisions are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

15.36 Local Plan Policy ENV10 concerns the landscape and townscape setting and requires that new development should maintain and enhance local identity and distinctiveness and be informed by existing character. Policy ENV12 concerns the design and positioning of buildings and that new developments should be high quality and promote an inclusive design, comply with national technical standards and respect the character of the surrounding area. The position of the building on its site should relate positively to adjoining buildings, routes, open areas, streams and other features that contribute to the character of the area.

15.37 The majority of the site falls within the Chalk Valley and Downland Landscape Character Area (LCA). The south east corner of the site falls within the Heath/Farmland Mosaic LCA. The site is in arable agricultural use and makes a

positive contribution to local visual amenity. At approximately 200m width between Broadmead and the rear gardens of properties along Martel Close, the site defines the countryside-edge setting of the surrounding dwellings on three sides (as shown in Landscape and Visual Appraisal viewpoints 1 and 2). The surrounding area has an established low density, somewhat suburban, countryside-edge character of 1-2 storey residential properties. Due to the sloping topography of the site, there is limited visual connectedness with open countryside to the north.

15.38 The submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal identifies that the site can be seen in occasional middle-distance views from the north and south. From viewpoint 3 from a bridleway to the south of Broadmayne (S9/10) within the AONB the development is found to have a major/moderate adverse effect in year 1 and a moderate effect in year 10 through the urbanisation of the site. The site is not readily visible from other medium to long range views in the surrounding area (viewpoints 4 – 10).

15.39 Whilst the Council's Senior Landscape Officer has no in-principle objection to development of the site, they consider the illustrative proposals do not demonstrate the scale of development can be appropriately accommodated on site. This is due to: the lack of strategic landscape mitigation to the north west, south east and north east boundaries; the layout not adequately addressing easements; the location of the allotments; and the housing density and street parking which would have a suburban character considered to be inappropriate in the area. A number of the matters raised by the Senior Landscape Officer are detailed matters which cannot be confirmed at this outline stage. However, in considering this application, the Council must assess the impacts of developing the site for up to 80 dwellings.

15.40 Whilst the illustrative proposals represent one way in which up to 80 dwellings could be provided on the site, the illustrative masterplan shows how the detailed design of the site could be undertaken. It shows how the northern edge of the site could, subject to detailed design, be designed to provide an appropriate interface with open countryside to the north through provision of public open space, landscaping and allotments. There is capacity to incorporate play space within the areas of public open space shown within the site. The dwellings around the perimeter of the site would provide a suburban character similar to that experienced along Rectory Road or Conway Drive, albeit at a higher residential density. Bungalows provided along Broadmead could help to better integrate the eastern edge of the development with the surrounding dwellings on the east side of Broadmead. In the absence of strategic landscaping the proposals would have an adverse visual effect on views from the south.

15.41 There is no doubt that the redevelopment of the site for residential would fundamentally alter the character and appearance of the site from an agricultural field to a suburban housing estate as demonstrated by viewpoints 1 and 2. This would inevitably result in the erosion of the existing countryside-edge character of this part of Broadmayne which is important to sense of place. The visual connection with the surrounding countryside would be diminished and only readily experienced at the northern end of Broadmead adjacent to the proposed SANG car park. The higher density of the site and provision of 2-storey dwellings across much of the site

would contrast with the existing character, height and density of the surrounding area.

15.42 The loss of the countryside-edge character of the site and surrounding area through redevelopment of the site with higher density development of 80 dwellings would not respect the character of the surrounding area and would not actively improve legibility or reinforce sense of place. The proposal would fail to mitigate the adverse visual effects identified in the applicant's Landscape and Visual Appraisal. The development would undermine the prevailing character of the area and have a harmful visual effect in conflict with Policies ENV1, ENV10 and ENV12 of the Local Plan.

Layout, design and open space

15.43 Policy ENV11 concerns the pattern of streets and spaces and notes housing should have provision for bins, recycling, drying, cycle parking, mobility scooters, private amenity/gardens and associated storage. Policy ENV15 states that development should optimise the potential of a site and make efficient use of land, subject to the limitations inherent in the site and impact on local character.

15.44 It must be noted that the submitted layout is illustrative only; its role is to indicate one way in which the proposed development could be developed having regard to site constraints. Matters relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping would be reserved as it is only the means of access which is currently sought. The illustrative proposal shows how the layout, scale and landscaping might be provided for 80 dwellings.

15.45 Alongside the 80 dwellings, the illustrative layout includes: three areas of public open space within the north, central and southern parts of the site: 27 allotments; retained trees and hedgerows along the western boundary; tree planting throughout the site. The general design approach shows the majority of dwellings would be two storey with the exception of the dwellings fronting Broadmead, which would be bungalows. Each dwelling would be provided with private amenity and parking would be provided either on-plot or within the central shared parking court. This would assist in addressing concerns that the proposals would lead to increased on street parking.

15.46 In response to comments from the Urban Design Officer requesting that a Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) be incorporated into the proposals, the Applicant advises play space can be provided in accordance with the Fields in Trust guidance. Whilst this is not shown on the illustrative proposal, there appears to be suitable space to accommodate play space within either the central or southern open spaces. Suitable play provision and compliance with guidance could be secured via planning obligation and planning condition. Similarly, parking serving the allotments could be incorporated at the detailed design stage and could be secured via planning condition. However, in this instance, the allotments are not considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and would not be secured via planning obligation or planning condition.

15.47 The proposals result in a density of approximately 17.5 dwellings per hectare (dph). This is comparable to the density of the existing dwellings to the east of the

site (approximately 15dph) but materially higher than the density of dwellings to the west along Martel Close (approximately 10dph). Subject to detailed design, the proposals could provide appropriate on-site amenity while retaining the capacity for up to 80 dwellings. However, the resultant design would not be comparable with local character (as identified in the assessment sections above).

15.48 In summary, notwithstanding the identified adverse impacts on local character, the illustrative layout is considered sufficient to form a basis to indicate that the site can be developed satisfactorily for future residents of the development.

Heritage impacts

15.49 There are several listed buildings within Broadmayne, the majority of which are located within the village core along Main Street (A352). The closest listed building is the Grade II listed Sunnyside cottage, located at 2 Main Street approximately 190m north east of the site (Listing Entry: 1323944).

15.50 It is not considered that the proposals have the potential to affect the significance of any built designated heritage assets owing to the distance from the application site and presence of substantial intervening development.

15.51 A number of objections have raised concerns with the removal of the concrete hard standing on the east side of Rectory Road in order to create a new 2m footway. Rectory Road has historical importance regarding the D-Day landings where it was used for equipment maintenance and the refuelling and parking of heavy vehicles. It is considered to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset for assessment purposes as result of this historical significance.

15.52 With no footway along much of Rectory Road, the applicant has sought to address the highway safety issue through off-site mitigation. The mitigation is supported by the Highways Authority. Nevertheless, the off-site highway works would result in the total loss of the Non-Designated Heritage Asset. In accordance with the NPPF (Para. 203) the effect on the significance of the Non Designated Heritage Asset should be taken into account in determining the application.

15.53 The harm to the Non-Designated Heritage Asset is considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposals noted in Section 15 of this report; namely the provision of a minimum of 45% affordable housing. As such, the proposal is acceptable in heritage terms and in accordance with the NPPF and Local Plan Policy ENV4.

Residential amenity

Existing Residents

15.54 The properties surrounding the site have benefitted from views out on to the undeveloped field since their construction and from the responses received clearly value the open amenity of the site.

15.55 The development of the site would inevitably impact on the outlook from surrounding properties. Due to the position of neighbours, predominantly with rear gardens facing onto the application site, it would be possible to design the

development to avoid significant adverse impacts on the residential amenity of existing residents through overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of sunlight/daylight. It would also be possible to ensure that any new dwellings would not result in an overbearing impact on existing dwellings or result in unacceptable overshadowing through careful control of the layout and design at the reserved matters stage.

15.56 It is accepted that the outlook for surrounding neighbours would change as a result of the proposals. The result of the proposal would be that surrounding neighbours would view the proposed residential properties from across surrounding roads (properties along Broadmead) or their rear gardens (properties along Martel Close, Chalky Road and Littlemead). This relationship would be an ordinary suburban relationship similar to other parts of Broadmayne.

15.57 Objectors also raise concerns the proposals could result in a loss of property value. This is not a material planning consideration and cannot be considered in the determination of this application.

15.58 Adverse impacts on residential amenity through the construction process (including noise, light spill and vehicle movements) would be temporary and could be satisfactorily controlled by a suitably worded planning condition requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Future Residents

15.59 At the proposed density, appropriate amenity for further residents is considered capable of being provided and adverse impacts through loss of privacy, overlooking, daylight/sunlight and overshadowing are capable of being resolved at the detailed design stage.

15.60 In respect of noise, there are limited sources of noise close to the application site. The closest potential source of noise is the A352, located approximately 200m from the site to the north east and separated by intervening residential development and the ridge on the SANG site. Due to the separation distance, suitable residential amenity from a noise perspective is achievable and no mitigation measures are required.

15.61 In summary, it is considered that the proposal is likely to be acceptable in residential amenity terms subject to appropriate design and layout.

Flood risk and drainage

15.62 The application site falls entirely within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding) as indicated by the Environment Agency's (EA) indicative mapping of fluvial flood risk. However, parts of the southeast of the site adjacent to properties along Chalky Lane also have elevated risk of flooding from surface water (1 in 30yr, 1 in 100yr and 1 in 1,000 year risk level). Within this area of elevated surface water flood risk, the illustrative proposal shows that housing would be located outside of the area at risk of surface water flooding.

15.63 The application is supported by a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), which incorporates a preliminary/conceptual drainage strategy. The concept drainage strategy utilises SUDS to manage surface water run off from the site. It

includes a series of soakaways, permeable paving and tree pits. A large soakaway is proposed with the central public open space which drains into the flow path at the southern end of the site. As part of the drainage strategy, a new highway drainage soakaway would be provided from Broadmead. This would allow existing highway gullies to be disconnected from the public foul sewer network which would represent a betterment to off-site flood risk at Rectory Close.

15.64 The Council's Flood Risk Management Team (as Lead Local Flood Authority) has no in-principle objection to the proposed development or conceptual drainage strategy subject to a pre-commencement condition in respect of detailed design and maintenance. Subject to these conditions, the proposal would be acceptable from a surface water drainage and flood risk perspective in accordance with Policy ENV5 and the NPPF and would also provide off-site betterment as noted above.

15.65 Foul waste is proposed to be disposed of by the public foul sewer. Wessex Water has not raised an objection subject to ensuring development is located outside the necessary easements. Subject to detailed design, the development can be located outside of Wessex Waters' easements.

Ecology

Biodiversity

15.66 As an agricultural field, the site currently provides modest ecological value.

15.67 The Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) considers the ecological impacts of the proposal and outlines mitigation measures to deliver biodiversity gains. The LEMP identifies a series of mitigation measures for reptiles, bats and badgers alongside a schedule of works for the first five years. Biodiversity measures include:

1. Adoption of sensitive lighting scheme;
2. Creation of approximately 1.3ha of tussocky grassland within the southern part of the site, close to properties along Chalky Road;
3. Creation of amenity grassland;
4. Tree and hedgerow planting;
5. Provision of bat boxes to at least 50% of houses;
6. Provision of bird boxes to at least 50% of houses;
7. Installation of two bee bricks to each house;
8. Installation of four hedgehog houses; and
9. Creation of wildlife pond.

15.68 Having regard to the submitted LEMP and the associated certificate of approval from NET the proposal would not have an adverse impact on biodiversity interests and would deliver biodiversity net gains compared to the existing arable use. Planning conditions would be capable of securing the mitigation measures as set out in the LEMP and for details of external lighting to be submitted and approved prior to installation (see below). Management of ecology in accordance with the LEMP would be secured via a Section 106 legal agreement.

Heathland mitigation

15.69 The proposed residential development site lies within 400m and 5km of Warmwell Heath, part of the internationally protected Dorset Heathlands, and

therefore mitigation is required as set out in the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020- 2025 SPD. The proposal for up to 80 dwellings, 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.

15.70 The appropriate assessment has concluded that the mitigation measures set out in the Dorset Heathlands 2015-2020 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 a SANG on adjoining land to the north would be provided as a HIP. The SANG is proposed in detail as part of the related planning application P/FUL/2021/05255 and is subject to a separate officer report.

15.71 In summary, the SANG provision is approximately 9 hectares, and results from the requirements and guidance of the Dorset Heathlands 2015-2020 SPD. Appendix E of the Dorset Heathlands SPD contains guidelines for the quality of SANGs and includes a checklist of requirements, such as the provision of vehicle parking arrangements; pedestrian access; the design and length of walking routes; the provision of signage; advertising of the SANG to ensure members of the public are aware of it; inclusion of habitats; ensuring sites have a semi-natural character; connections to the public right of way network; and the provision of adequate space for the exercise of dogs.

15.72 Natural England is satisfied that the proposals are sufficient to meet the requirements of the SPD and to ensure the SANG is useable by those who will occupy the proposed development. The proposed SANG is within walking distance of the proposed development and would contain visitor parking spaces.

15.73 SAMM, which forms the second strand of the strategy, requires that contributions be secured via Section 106 from all development where there is a net increase in dwellings. The strategic approach to access management is necessary to ensure that displacement does not occur across boundaries.

15.74 A Section 106 legal agreement would need to secure:

- the implementation, maintenance and management of the proposed SANG area
- the payment of a SANG Maintenance Sum (to safeguard the Council against deficiencies in the owner's management)
- a SAMM contribution of towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring in accordance with the Dorset Heathlands SPD.

15.75 A Habitat Regulations Assessment of the proposal concluded that, with the above mitigation secured the development will not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites so in accordance with Regulation 70 of the Habitats Regulations 2017 planning permission can be granted.

Poole Harbour

15.76 The proposed development site falls within the catchment area of Poole Harbour, an internationally protected site. Mitigation is therefore required.

15.77 Increased wastewater from new development, including new residential developments, has the potential to increase levels of phosphorus and nitrogen within Poole Harbour. The proposed development has the potential to result in adverse impacts on water quality via enrichment, given the addition of up to 80 new dwellings.

15.78 The applicant has submitted a Nutrient Neutrality Technical Note which assesses the residential and SANG applications in combination. It demonstrates the proposal would be nitrogen neutral. In respect of phosphorus, the assessment concludes the proposal would generate approximately 88kg of phosphorus per year which would contribute to an increase in phosphorous loading within the water environment and Poole Harbour in the absence of mitigation.

15.79 An offsite mitigation solution is proposed. This would result in the net reduction in nitrogen and phosphorus through the provision of packaged treatment waste water treatment facilities. Together with a planning condition limiting the use of water to 110litres per day, Dorset Council is satisfied that the proposal would not result in an adverse effect on the Poole Harbour. This is confirmed via the Appropriate Assessment undertaken by Dorset Council and reviewed by Natural England. Subject to securing the mitigation, the proposal would therefore accord with Policy ENV2, of the Local Plan, Paragraphs 179-80 of the NPPF and the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

Trees

15.80 Landscaping is a reserved matter. Nevertheless, the LEMP confirms all trees, hedgerows and bramble scrub will be retained and protected by minimum 2m buffer areas during construction. The LEMP confirms approximately 50 trees would be planted.

15.81 A number of objections from neighbouring residents raise concerns with the accuracy of trees plotted on the Tree Survey and state a number of the trees fall within the residential gardens of properties along Martel Close rather than within the boundary of the site.

15.82 Given the outline nature of the application and commitment for all trees to be retained, impacts on trees are considered to be acceptable subject to planning conditions requiring an Arboricultural Method Statement to be prepared at the detailed design stage.

Archaeology

15.83 The site is not a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) and does not have any archaeological designations. However, the site has high potential for archaeological remains as noted within the Applicant's Archaeological Evaluation Report and Archaeological and Heritage Assessment. South of the site there are large numbers of prehistoric remains with numerous bronze-age round and bank barrows along the inland ridgeway. Closer to the centre of the village there are the remains of a shrunken medieval village around the village core. There is no evidence of

intervening development on the application site although archaeological potential on the site is considered high.

15.84 The Council's Archaeologist has commented that due to the potential sensitivity, an examination of the archaeological potential of the site is necessary before development can proceed. This is required to include archaeological fieldwork together with post-excavation work. Subject to a planning condition to secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation the proposal is acceptable from an archaeological perspective.

External Lighting

15.85 No details of external lighting are proposed at this outline stage. Nevertheless, street lighting is expected and the Council's Street Lighting Team identifies that a number of alterations to the illustrative proposals would be required to accommodate the necessary street lighting for highway adoption. A planning condition requiring details of external lighting would be sufficient to ensure the suitable provision of external lighting at the Reserved Matters stage and minimisation of light pollution and impacts on ecology.

Minerals safeguarding

15.86 Part of the north west of the site is designated as a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) and identified as having potential for sand and gravel. Within MSAs, Policy SG1 of the Minerals Plan seeks to avoid sterilisation as far as possible and encourages prior extraction where practicable.

15.87 The Minerals Planning Authority recommends that the feasibility of extraction is investigated via a method statement. Subject to the imposition of the recommended condition, the proposed development would be acceptable from a minerals safeguarding perspective.

Community Infrastructure Levy

15.88 The adopted charging schedule applies a levy on proposals that create a dwelling and/or a dwelling with restricted holiday use. All other development types are therefore set a £0 per square metre CIL rate. The development proposal is CIL liable. Should planning permission be granted on appeal, the development would be CIL liable. Associated CIL payments would contribute to associated community infrastructure, such as: healthcare; education; and play space which would address the community infrastructure related concerns raised by objectors. The proposal accords with Local Plan Policy COM1.

Environmental Impact Assessment

15.89 Following consideration of the relevant selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 development presented in Schedule 3 of the EIA regulations, it is concluded that the proposed development is unlikely to result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, an EIA is not required in this instance.

16.0 Conclusion

16.1 The site comprises a 4.7ha agricultural field in the village of Broadmayne. It lies adjacent to the existing developed areas of the village, surrounded on three sides by dwellings.

16.2 The applicant has advised of the *intention* to provide all dwellings (up to 80) as affordable with a 50:50 split between affordable rented and intermediate. Whilst this is commendable, the application is assessed on the basis of 45% affordable housing given the intention to provide 100% affordable cannot be committed to or secured via planning obligation. The intention is therefore afforded very limited weight in the planning balance. Nevertheless, this report considers the principle of both the proposal as a mixed tenure development and potential as a solely affordable (rural exception site) and concludes that the principle of either option would not be acceptable.

16.3 There is a balance to be struck in considering a proposal which would deliver new housing in a location which the Local Plan does not envisage as the most sustainable location for housing. The provision of housing outside of the DDB would be contrary to Local Plan Policy SUS2 and there would be local adverse effects caused by residential development of the site. The proposal would fundamentally alter the character and appearance of the site and would erode the countryside-edge character of this part of Broadmayne, an important component of the village's sense of place, and sterilise best and most versatile agricultural land. The higher density of the site and provision of 2-storey dwellings across much of the site would contrast with the existing character, height and density of the surrounding area and would not be in harmony with local character. The proposals would also fail to mitigate limited visual impacts from the surrounding public right of way network to the south of Broadmayne.

16.4 Notwithstanding this policy conflict, the proposal would deliver a number of notable benefits, including:

1. Provision of much needed affordable housing +10% above the policy requirement;
2. Provision of public open space within and adjacent to the site (the SANG) including children's play space;
3. Associated socio-economic benefits generated by new residents and through the construction of the development, including spending within the local economy;
4. Off-site improvements to surface water drainage by removing existing highway gullies from sewer network; and
5. Off-site highway safety improvements to introduce new footways;

16.5 The loss of the concrete hard standing on the east side of Rectory Road (a Non Designated Heritage Asset) to provide a footway would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal noted above (NPPF Para. 203).

16.6 For the avoidance of doubt, the enhanced affordable housing provision beyond the policy requirement could only be secured if Members considered the additional

+10% provision necessary to make the development acceptable due to the benefits of the proposal (outlined above) outweighing the disbenefits.

16.7 Overall, the sum of the benefits is not considered sufficient to overcome the unacceptable principle of development, harm to local character and loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. In the absence of a completed S106 legal agreement there are also additional reasons for refusal relating to affordable housing provision, SANG and SAMMS provision and the resulting impact on Dorset Heathlands, significant impacts on Poole Harbour, lack of provision of a locally equipped area for play and off-site highway impacts.

17.0 Recommendation

- 1 The proposal would result in the unnecessary development of best and most versatile agricultural land for residential development outside the defined development boundary. Furthermore, it would result in an unsustainable pattern of development which would be disproportionate in scale to the village of Broadmayne and harmful to the countryside and local character through adverse visual effects and impacts on the countryside-edge character of this part of Broadmayne as a result of the quantum, density and scale of the development. The proposal is contrary to Policies SUS2, ENV1 (part iii), ENV8 (part ii), ENV10 and ENV12 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and the NPPF (2021).
- 2 In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement to secure affordable housing the proposal would be contrary to Policy HOUS1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and the NPPF (2021).
- 3 In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement to secure provision of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) the associated likely significant effects on Dorset Heathlands are not mitigated, contrary to: West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) Policy ENV2; Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 SPD (2006); National Planning Policy Framework (2021) Paragraphs 174 and 180; and the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats Regulations 2017.
- 4 In the absence of mitigation to ensure nutrient neutrality the associated likely significant effects on Poole Harbour SSSI, SPA and Ramsar through increased nitrogen and phosphate loads are not mitigated, contrary to: West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) Policy ENV2; National Planning Policy Framework (2021) Paragraphs 174 and 180; and the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats Regulations 2017.
- 5 In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement to secure a Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) the proposal would be contrary to Policy COM1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and the NPPF (2021).
- 6 In the absence of a completed Section 106 legal agreement to secure off-site highway improvement works the proposal would be contrary to Policy COM7

of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) and the NPPF (2021).

Informatives

1. National Planning Policy Framework

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 did not take the opportunity to enter into pre-application discussions.

-The applicant was advised that the proposal did not accord with the development plan and that there were no material planning considerations to outweigh these concerns.

-The applicant was offered the opportunity to submit amended plans to overcome concerns identified by the case officer but chose not to do so.

-The applicant and council have worked together to minimise the reasons for refusal.

2. If planning permission is subsequently granted for this development at appeal, it will be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) introduced by the Town and Country Planning Act 2008. A CIL liability notice will then be issued by the Council that requires a financial payment, full details of which will be explained in the notice.

3. The plans considered as part of this application comprise:

- Location Plan P0001
- Proposed Broadmead Site Access General Arrangement 23054-04-6 Rev B
- Proposed Broadmead Site Access Rectory Road Junction Alterations and Footway Works 23054-04-7 Rev B