

<b>Application Number:</b>	P/FUL/2023/00324
<b>Webpage:</b>	<a href="https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/">https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/</a>
<b>Site address:</b>	Steepleton Manor B3159 Junction A35t To Rew Manor Winterbourne Steepleton Dorset DT2 9LG
<b>Proposal:</b>	Proposed change of use including alterations to form 13 residential flats with ancillary accommodation and communal facilities (red line extended to include grounds and garden of manor)
<b>Applicant name:</b>	Stonehouse Projects
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Bob Burden
<b>Ward Member(s):</b>	Cllr Tarr

**1.0** The application has been brought to committee given that there is an outstanding Environment Agency objection which would result in the need to refer the application to the Secretary of State under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2024 if the committee resolve to grant planning permission.

**2.0 Summary of recommendation:**

Delegate authority to the Head of Planning and the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement to approve subject to:

- 1) satisfactory outcome of referral to Secretary of State (due to Environment Agency objection);
- 2) Completion of satisfactory section 106 agreement to secure affordable housing financial contribution (£132,173); and
- 3) Planning conditions.

**3.0 Reason for the recommendation:**

- Para 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise.
- The location is considered to be sustainable and the proposal is acceptable in its design and general visual impact.
- There is not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

#### 4.0 Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	Acceptable as site close to defined development boundary and no specific local plan policy to retain care homes.
Affordable housing	On site provision not appropriate hence an off-site contribution of £132,172 required.
Effect on heritage assets	Acceptable impacts on listed buildings and conservation area.
Effect on residential amenity	Separation distances and nature of use compatible with residential amenity in locality.
Ecological considerations	Acceptable.
Flood Risk	Environment Agency objection, however, the proposed use is in the same vulnerability class as the former care home, and measures would be effected to help minimise flood-risk.
Highways	Existing vehicular access and largely existing parking areas to be used.
EIA	Not required.

#### 5.0 Description of Site

The site is located on the south side of the B3159 road running through Winterborne Steepleton. It is located approximately 80 metres southwest of the Church of St Michael. The building itself faces onto and is set back approximately 40 metres from the B3159, behind a gated entrance way and walled courtyard. To the west of the courtyard there is access to a separate, ancillary courtyard which contains the former coach house and stable block, with the ground-floor former service wing of the house forming its southern range.

The existing main Manor building has been used as a residential care home up until its closure on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2023. The Manor sits in extensive lawned and landscaped grounds and there is an adjoining stable/coach house and its courtyard to the west side. The Manor, with attached Courtyard Walls and Gates, and the Stable and Coach house are each separately listed Grade II. These buildings were built about 1870. The building was built for William Charles Lambert who had commissioned the architect T. H. Wyatt to build it. It follows a restrained Gothic style. The Manor is built of rock-faced Portland Stone walls with Hamstone dressings under slate and clay tiled roofs. Fenestration is based on wooden sashes. Gabled dormers are present and a two storey porch at the centre with buttresses and barley sugar finials. The Coach house/stables service building are also of rock-faced masonry walls with Hamstone dressings under clay tiles. Windows have mullions and sashes.

The South Winterborne stream watercourse runs to the north of the site and it also flows across the north-east part of the site grounds.

The north edge of the site is bounded by the road with several dwellings along Mill Lane opposite, and St Michaels and All Angels Church to the north-east. East of the site is open agricultural land, and more agricultural land beyond the south of the site beyond the rising land to the south and the site's wooded edge. Immediately west of the service wing is a dwelling known as Old Manor Cottage. Beyond the western "limb" of the grounds are several dwellings.

The site is almost adjoining (about 100m) from the defined development boundary. It lies within the Winterborne Steepleton Conservation Area and is also within the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

## 6.0 Description of Development

The scheme involves making alterations to the Manor House and to the Stable/coach House wing to convert the former care home to 13 self contained flats with ancillary supporting facilities. There is minimal external alteration but more extensive internal alterations. The existing vehicular access would be retained and the frontage courtyard and coach house courtyard areas would continue to be used for car parking with some added spaces in the coach house courtyard.

## 7.0 Relevant Planning History

WD/D/15/001810 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 02/11/2015

Alterations and renovations to care home premises

WD/D/15/001811 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 02/11/2015

Alterations and renovations to care home premises

WD/D/17/000714 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 09/10/2017

Demolition of derelict outbuildings

WD/D/17/002278 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 06/11/2017

Demolition of derelict outbuildings

WD/D/18/000793 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 08/05/2018

Request for confirmation of compliance with condition of 3 planning approval

WD/D/17/000714

WD/D/18/000802 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 08/05/2018

Request for confirmation of compliance with condition of 3 planning approval

WD/D/17/002278

WD/D/19/002497 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 30/12/2019

T1 Acer Negundo - Fell - potential to fall on car park area

1/E/05/002354 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 31/01/2006

Remove studwork partition infill to existing archway. Erect replacement first to second floor staircase together with new fire resistant roller shutter

1/E/06/000645 - Decision: WIT - Decision Date: 24/05/2006

Carry out external and internal alterations

1/E/06/001469 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 19/10/2006

Remove internal partitions, screen and stairs. Erect new partitions install new staircase, forming new door opening. Install new raised and floating floors. Install new window and glazed screen altering existing window and door.

1/E/07/001135 - Decision: WIT - Decision Date: 15/08/2007

Erect extension comprising of 16No bedrooms and ancillary facilities. Carry out alterations to form entrance. Repair existing garden walls

1/E/07/001136 - Decision: WIT - Decision Date: 15/08/2007

Erect extension comprising of 16No bedrooms and ancillary facilities. Carry out alterations to form entrance. Repair existing garden walls

1/D/08/000159 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 18/04/2008

Erect extension with 16No bedrooms and ancillary facilities. Carry out alterations to form entrance and repair garden walls.

1/D/08/000160 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 18/04/2008

Erect extension with 16No bedrooms and ancillary facilities. Carry out alterations to form entrance and repair garden walls

1/D/09/001596 - Decision: WIT - Decision Date: 20/11/2009

Convert first floor bedroom to an assisted bathroom. Relocation of laundry & convert former laundry to assisted bathroom, sluice & dispensary

1/D/09/001966 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 03/02/2010

Internal alterations

1/D/10/001429 - Decision: WIT - Decision Date: 18/10/2010

Extend time limit for implementation of 1/D/08/000159 to erect extension with 16No bedrooms and ancillary facilities. Carry out alterations to form entrance and repair garden walls

1/D/11/000262 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 28/04/2011

Extend time limit for implementation of 1/D/08/000160 to erect extension with 16No bedrooms and ancillary facilities. Carry out alterations to form entrance and repair garden walls

1/D/11/000220 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 28/04/2011

Extend time limit for implementation of 1/D/08/000159 to erect extension with 16No bedrooms and ancillary facilities. Carry out alterations to form entrance and repair garden walls

P/LBC/2022/02096 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 18/05/2022

Installation of solar PV panels on detached outbuilding

## 8.0 List of Constraints

STABLES AND COACH HOUSE 30 METRES NORTH WEST OF STEEPLETON MANOR listed building grade G2. HE Reference: 1229226

BARN 30 METRES SOUTH OF MANOR FARMHOUSE listed building grade G2. HE Reference: 1229314

STEEPLETON MANOR WITH ATTACHED COURTYARD WALLS AND GATES listed building grade G2. HE Reference: 1279269

Grade: II Listed Building: UNIDENTIFIED MONUMENT 8 METRES SOUTH OF CHANCEL OF CHURCH OF ST MICHAEL List Entry: 1279196.0; - Distance: 14.36

Grade: II Listed Building: WHITE MONUMENT 4 METRES SOUTH OF CHANCEL OF CHURCH OF ST MICHAEL List Entry: 1229186.0; - Distance: 19.63

Grade: II\* Listed Building: SHERRING MONUMENT 3 METRES SOUTH OF CHANCEL OF CHURCH OF ST MICHAEL List Entry: 1279268.0; - Distance: 20.63

Grade: II Listed Building: HODDER MONUMENT 9 METRES SOUTH WEST OF TOWER OF CHURCH OF ST MICHAEL List Entry: 1229080.0; - Distance: 18.61

Grade: I Listed Building: CHURCH OF ST MICHAEL List Entry: 1229137.0; - Distance: 24.55

Grade: II Listed Building: OLD MANOR COTTAGE List Entry: 1229227.0; - Distance: 11.83

Grade: II Listed Building: COTTAGE 12 METRES EAST OF MANOR FARMHOUSE List Entry: 1229323.0; - Distance: 19.29

Application is within a conservation area

TPO (WDDC/640) - Distance: 0

Important Local Buildings, Record Key = 2327 - Distance: 0

Poole Harbour Nutrient Catchment Area; Poole Harbour - Distance: 0

Groundwater Source Protection Areas; - Distance: 0

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; Dorset - Distance: 0

Landscape Character; Open Chalk Downland; South Dorset Downs - Distance: 0

Land Outside DDBs; Distance: 0

Legal Agreements S106 - Distance: 0

Winterbourne Abbas CP - Distance: 929.37

Winterbourne Steepleton CP - Distance: 0

Winterborne St. Martin CP - Distance: 444.52

PROW - Right of Way: Bridleway S59/1; - Distance: 17.35

NG - National Grid Overhead Line AXMINSTER - CHICKERELL - MANNINGTON  
Operating 400; - Distance: 468.08

NG - National Grid Tower 10034322.0 (height 143.42000000000002); - Distance:  
479.53

High Risk of Foul Sewer Inundation - Distance: 0

Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 30 - Distance: 0

Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 100 - Distance: 0

Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 1000 - Distance: 0

Risk of Groundwater Emergence; Groundwater levels are between 0.5m and 5m  
below the ground surface.; There is a risk of flooding to subsurface assets but  
surface manifestation of groundwater is unlikely.; - Distance: 0

Risk of Groundwater Emergence; Groundwater levels are between 0.025m and 0.5m  
below the ground surface.; Within this zone there is a risk of groundwater flooding to  
both surface and subsurface assets. There is the possibility of groundwater  
emerging at the surface locally.; - Distance: 0

Risk of Groundwater Emergence; Groundwater levels are either at or very near  
(within 0.025m of) the ground surface.; Within this zone there is a risk of  
groundwater flooding to both surface and subsurface assets. Groundwater may  
emerge at significant rates and has the capacity to flow overland and/or pond within  
any topographic low spots.; - Distance: 0

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB): Dorset; - Distance: 0

Scheduled Monument: Two round barrows on North Hill (List Entry: 1002865); -  
Distance: 202.56

Flood Zone 3 - Distance: 0

Flood Zone 2 - Distance: 0

RAD - Radon: Class: Less than 1% - Distance: 0

RAD - Radon: Class: 3 - 5% - Distance: 0

Grade II listed buildings (statutory duty to preserve or enhance the significance of  
heritage assets under the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990)

Within the Winterborne Steepleton Conservation Area (statutory duty to preserve or  
enhance the significance of heritage assets under the Planning (Listed Buildings &  
Conservation Areas) Act 1990)

National Landscapes (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty): (statutory protection in order to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of their landscapes - National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 & Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000)

Historic Contaminated Land - Description: Quarrying of sand & clay, operation of sand & gravel pits

## 9.0 Consultations

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

### Consultees

**DC - Adult social care-** No comments received.

**DC - Public Health Dorset** - No comments received.

**Environmental Assessment Officer-** This application is for additional overnight accommodation within the Poole Harbour catchment. Therefore, there is a requirement for the developer to achieve nutrient neutrality for both nitrogen and phosphorus, as explained in the Natural England response. Unless they can demonstrate nutrient neutrality, then we will not be in a position to approve the application. Further information is available here: [Nutrient Neutrality in Poole Harbour - Dorset Council](#)

### And subsequently:

An Appropriate Assessment has been carried out due to the site's potential effect on the Poole Harbour SPA and Ramsar. This concludes that the scheme will not have a significant effect on this SPA/Ramsar. It concludes that there is a likely decrease in the occupancy of the building and therefore a likely decrease in the nitrogen and phosphorous discharges. Water efficiency measures may also result in a decrease in nutrient discharges.

**DC – Highways-** No objection.

**DC - Dorset Waste Team-** No comments received.

**DC - Housing Standards-** No objection.

**DC - Policy - Urban Design-** No comments.

**DC - Housing Enabling Team** - There are over 4,600 households on the Dorset Council housing register and there is a high need for affordable housing across the area. Affordable Housing Policy HOUS1 of the adopted Local Plan expects on-site provision to be provided. Policy seeks 35% affordable housing, or, if appropriate a suitable financial contribution. It is considered that this could be dealt with by means of an affordable housing contribution. This is mainly because splitting the flats between open market and affordable housing units tends to be problematic in

practical and management terms. It would be hard to find a Registered Provider prepared to take on on-site affordable housing provision in a development like this. Using the average market housing areas listed on plan 22037 (1094.7m<sup>2</sup> divided by 13) of 84.2m<sup>2</sup> there would be a requirement to provide £132,173 in affordable housing contributions. No objection if this is agreed and subject to a s106 agreement.

**DC - Env. Services – Protection-** No comment.

**DC - Building Control West Team -** None received.

**DC – Senior Conservation Officer -** Manor House-

Where the blocking up of openings or removal of partition walls are identified on indicative plans, the retention of historic legibility, by way of forming intentional reveals and the introduction of structural piers and down-stand beams, respectively, is welcomed. As reviewed onsite, in parallel with indicative plan no. 22037 PA 18E, where the limited removal of C19 library shelving is proposed to facilitate a partial-height *en suite*, the top, decorative section of the existing bookcase should be retained and incorporated into the overall *en suite* design, where practicable to do so.

Overall, we consider proposed design alterations, to the existing ground, first and second floor floorplan, to be appropriate in both intention and approach with regard proposed interventions within broader context of the principal house. Furthermore, it is considered that in each instance, where the loss of historic fabric is considered likely, a clear and considered justification has been demonstrated that promotes a pragmatic, low-impact approach, with regard the highest retention level of historic fabric, to realise the maximum possible potential for the proposed extent of each suite.

**Former Coach house and Stable Block-**

Proposals broadly comprise the removal of modern partitions, to better realise the original, open plan nature of the space, and the replacement of modern windows and door with timber framed, double glazed units. Within the specific context of the application, we consider these works to be appropriate and perceive them to offer a tangible degree of enhancement.

Overall, proposals are considered entirely appropriate in both intention and approach and in demonstrating sensitive, mitigative, and informed interventions that realise a perceived degree of enhancement and promotion toward securing the site's future, viable use.

By virtue of the extent of partial loss of some historic partitions and C19 bookshelves, proposals will result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. However, we consider the degree of historic fabric loss, within the broader context of the building overall, has been clearly and convincingly justified.

Conclusion; No harm to Manor and less than substantial harm to former Coach House and Stables. No harm to conservation area.



**DC- Flood-Risk Management - (8/11/23)**- I have previously provided responses (the most recent on 15 September 2023) in which I recommended a holding objection. The applicant has submitted the following updated flood risk documentation:

- Report: Flood Risk Assessment, by GeoSmart Information Ltd, ref 79732.02R1, and dated 2/11/23.
- Report: Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan, by GeoSmart Information Ltd, ref 79732R4, and dated 27/10/23.

After review of the above documents, I can re-iterate my previous position. I have stated in previous responses that the proposed development is compatible with the mapped surface water flood risk and other sources of flooding, with the exception of fluvial flooding. The proposed development may or may not be compatible with the fluvial flood risk. The Environment Agency are responsible for assessing the fluvial flood risk.

I have been recommending a holding objection from the LLFA until the EA had provided their support for the proposed development or objection. I maintain this position even though there is no in-principal objection from the LLFA due to the flood risk from non-fluvial sources.

- If the EA remove their objection, then the LLFA will also remove their objection. I am taking this strategy as a 'safety net' rather than removing the LLFA's objection now. But if the LPA consider this is an unnecessary strategy, then the LLFA's holding objection can be removed now. No surface water drainage or flood related conditions are required/recommended from the LLFA.

**NHS Dorset (Dorset Integrated Care Board) ICB**- No comments received.

**Dorset Police Architectural Liaison Officer** - No objection.

**Dorset and Wiltshire Fire & Rescue Service** - No comments received.

**Natural England**- This proposal potentially affects European Sites vulnerable to nutrient impacts. Please refer to Natural England's overarching advice dated 16th March 2022 and sent to all relevant Local Planning Authorities.

**Historic England**- Not offering advice. Suggest seek views of specialist conservation/archaeological advisers.

**Environment Agency – (summarised)**

**24/5/23**- Advise that the applicant should provide a more detailed FRA to include estimated design flood level data and flood extent, including climate change, together with any necessary mitigation proposals and Emergency Flood Plan. The applicant should take advice from the LLFA who, are the risk management authority for the local watercourses and other sources of flooding, for more local understanding and detailed advice regarding flood risk at this site. Given this we

recommend that detailed comments are provided by both us and the LLFA with respect to flood risk at the site, for the local authority's consideration.

The existing and proposed use vulnerability classifications are both More Vulnerable (NPPF, Annex 3: Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification). In essence the proposal is for a Change of Use from a care home to residential flats. COU applications are not required to satisfy the Sequential Test but they are still required to satisfy the Exception Test, including demonstration of no resultant increase in flood risk to the site or elsewhere by way of a detailed FRA (see [Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/flood-risk-and-coastal-change)) for more details. Whilst it appears that the flats would not be individually sold (section 4.2 of the Design & Access Statement Rev.C, dated 11 April 2023), the fact remains that the proposal would result in 8 self-contained ground floor flats (which are of particular concern in flood risk areas) for rent. Without a more detailed understanding of flood risk at the site, we are not able to confirm whether we consider the proposal to be acceptable.

Further to the above, we are also concerned that the proposal would provide self-contained ground floor flats, which are at increased risk of flooding. Flats 1 - 6 have direct internal connectivity to the lift and lobby stairwell, so occupants could escape to the first-floor landing, but they would not have access to any private (self-contained access within their own home) internal safe haven. Flats 7 and 8 do not have internal connectivity to the main building. Flat 8 does have an internal self-contained first floor safe haven in the form of a first-floor bedroom, but Flat 7 does not. We advise that if the building is to be subdivided, it should be done in such a way as to provide two storey dwellings, so each individual dwelling has an internal self-contained first floor safe haven, with no ground floor self-contained dwellings provided. Based on the current lack of detailed flood risk evidence we would not support self-contained ground floor dwellings.

**9/8/23-** Object-The site is shown to fall within fluvial Flood Zone 3. The (revised) FRA has confirmed that raising floor levels to appropriate levels is unlikely to be possible. Therefore in order to deliver safe development we consider it important that dwellings have internal access to an appropriate upper storey refuge. Flats 1 - 6 have direct internal connectivity to the lift and lobby stairwell, so occupants could escape to the first-floor landing, but they would not have access to any private (self-contained access within their own home) internal safe haven. Flat 8 does have internal self-contained first floor safe haven, but Flat 7 does not have any access to an upper floor refuge. We maintain that if the building is to be subdivided, it should be done in such a way as to provide two storey dwellings, so each individual dwelling has an internal self-contained first floor safe haven in line with that provided for flat 8, with no ground floor self-contained dwellings provided. Based on the current flood risk evidence we would not support self-contained ground floor dwellings.

Overcoming our objection:

The applicant should submit a revised proposal which addresses the points highlighted above. Please re-consult us on any revised FRA submitted.

If you are minded to approve the application contrary to our objection, we request you contact us prior to a decision being made to allow us to make further representations.

Should our objection be removed, we may recommend the inclusion of conditions on any subsequent approval.

**21/12/23** - We maintain our objection, as the proposed development is providing insufficient flood risk mitigation to keep the development dry for its lifetime. We agree that the estimated internal flood depth to the proposed dwellings of 0.09m is shallow, so not considered to be a danger to life. We also concur with the Local Planning Authority that access/egress through water of less than 0.3m is not considered to be a danger to life, but we do remain concerned that the development will be provided with a known and unmitigated internal flood risk. We welcome the use of the flood barrier boards to Suite 7's external doors, however this may not be sufficient on its own to ensure a dry development due to the potential of permeability of the existing walls or floors. We also welcome any flood mitigation measures that can be provided to any of the buildings that would help ensure a dry development, however we understood from the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) that this was not possible. If we misunderstood this, we would be pleased to see a flood mitigation strategy.

Overcoming our objection:

To overcome our objection the applicant should submit a comprehensive flood mitigation strategy including structural integrity for example solid floor and flood proofing to wall/entrances. For guidance please see [Improving the Flood Performance of New Buildings \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.publishing.service.gov.uk). Please note that the strategy needs to meet building control regulations. If any flood risk mitigation strategy is submitted, please re-consult us. Please be aware that if you are minded to approve the application against our objection you are required to consult the Secretary of State.

**Winterborne and Broadmayne Ward** - No Local Member comments

**Winterbourne Steepleton PC**- The Parish Council welcomes the fact that this building will receive very much needed maintenance work and repairs. Local employment will be slightly reduced and the much needed nursing facility for the area lost. We are pleased that the external facades are not being affected. We would comment on the need for adequate on site parking - cars park on the church layby at present and car numbers will increase due to the self contained flats. Possible light pollution issues must also be taken into account with any added parking areas. The walled garden area should be preserved and not altered in any way.

### **Representations received**

3 letters of objection/comment: The main planning related points include-

No bus service; all dependent on private car.

Concern that car parking on-site may be inadequate; vehicles may park on road/by church.

Concern parking may extend into lawned grounds of the Manor, causing visual intrusion to conservation area.

Light pollution of parking areas - potentially detrimental to bats foraging, and visual harm. Any lighting would need careful design.

Pleased to see investment in the building to improve condition.

Regrettable loss of nursing facility and employment.

Query financial viability of scheme.

Walled garden should not be altered.

A neighbour comments: I live next door to this property and if flood waters ever reached the floor level of the Manor, my cottage would be under 1m of water! I think this is an over reaction as the valley as a whole drains to the east and Steepleton is some 6m above Martinstown - I cannot see how water levels would ever get this high. The EA maps are misleading - a site visit would confirm my above statements.

## 10.0 Duties

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 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990- section 16 requires that in considering whether to grant listed building consent, special regard is to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) requires that regard is had to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (National Landscapes).

## 11.0 Relevant Policies

### Development Plan Policies

#### **Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan:**

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

- INT1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- ENV1 - Landscape, seascape & sites of other geological interest
- ENV2 - Wildlife and habitats
- ENV4 - Heritage assets
- ENV5 - Flood risk
- ENV10 - The landscape and townscape setting
- ENV 12 - The design and positioning of buildings

- ENV 16 - Amenity
- SUS2 - Distribution of development
- SUS3 - Adaptation and re-use of buildings outside defined development boundaries
- COM7 - Creating a safe & efficient transport network
- COM9 - Parking provision
- HOUS1 - Affordable housing

Neighbourhood Plan – N/a

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

Section 4 – Decision taking

Section 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Section 6 - Building a strong competitive economy

Section 11 - Making effective use of land

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Section 14 - Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### **Other material considerations**

#### **Supplementary Planning Document/Guidance**

Dorset AONB Landscape Character Assessment

AONB Management Plan 2019-2024

Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD Adopted

Consultation Report - Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD

Consultation Statement - Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD

Dorset Council Interim Guidance and Position Statement Appendix B: Adopted Local Plan policies and objectives relating to climate change, renewable energy, and sustainable design and construction. December 2023.

#### Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance For West Dorset Area:

WDDC Design & Sustainable Development Planning Guidelines (2009)

Landscape Character Assessment February 2009 (West Dorset)

#### Conservation Area Appraisals:

Winterborne Steepleton Conservation Area Appraisal

## **12.0 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.

### **13.0 Public Sector Equalities Duty**

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

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

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove or minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the Public Sector Equalities Duty. The scheme includes lifts to facilitate access for any persons with mobility issues and conveniently located car parking relative to the residential units.

### **14.0 Financial benefits**

#### Material considerations

Affordable housing financial contribution £132,173

A number of full and part-time jobs likely to be created.

#### Non material considerations

CIL contributions

### **15.0 Environmental Implications**

There are various internal changes which will entail use of tools producing emissions, albeit at a likely relatively low level. Use of any non-electric private cars will produce emissions. However, this must be balanced against the fact that the former care home use would have generated significant vehicle movements in any event, and that the scheme alterations would enhance the character of the listed building.

### **16.0 Planning Assessment**

#### **Principle of development-**

The applicant states:

*The proposed scheme aims to internally renovate the building and rationalise the internal layout to remove some of the additions thereby forming luxury suites. These*

*newly formed suites will be available to rent with the building as a whole owned and managed by Stonehouse Projects or their elected management company.*

Regarding the principle, the proposal involves the change of use of a residential care home and the formation of 13 flats together with ancillary facilities related to the “hospitality/socialising” experience. The business model is that the flats (or later living suites) would be targeted at the mature resident (over 55), and residents could move around the country staying in other “high-end” flats whilst visiting those parts of the country.

The scheme would involve the loss of an existing care home. The Adults Commissioning Manager-Care Homes has previously commented that in this particular case, the relatively small size, rural location, coupled with the constraints of the historic layout of the listed building does not lend itself particularly well towards catering for residential care. Furthermore, there is no adopted Local Plan policy seeking to retain existing care homes.

Policy SUS2 of the Local Plan includes permitting “open market housing through the re-use of existing buildings”. Policy SUS3 is supportive of “open market housing . . . adjoining a settlement with a defined development boundary (DDB) . . . “. Whilst this site is not strictly adjoining the DDB it is only about 100m away. As such it can be regarded as broadly compliant with this policy subject to other material planning considerations.

Regarding employment the *existing* use (or when it was last used as a care home in October 2023) provided for:

- 1 x CQC Registered Manager
- 1 x Head of Care (Trained Nurse)
- 3 x Trained Nurses – Shift work – multiply by 2.
- 4 x Health Care Assistants – Shift work – multiply by 2.
- 1 x Catering Supervisor
- 1 X Activity Co-ordinator
- 1 x Handyman
- 1 x Part time ambulance driver

The *proposed* use, if fully carried out, could continue to provide employment including - 2x Chef and associated kitchen staff (full time), 1x Receptionist (full time), 2x Cleaners/housekeeping (part time) 2x Maintenance/grounds people (part time), 1x Concierge (full time), 1x Site Manager (full time), 1x Beauty therapist (part time)- 1x Bar staff (part time). The provision of these associated support services would not be conditioned as the application is being treated as Class C3 (dwellings). It is therefore possible that no employment would be provided at the site. It is however worth noting that if the full scheme proceeds in accordance with the applicant’s submission the employment numbers are broadly similar to those currently employed, and this type of employment is consistent with the definition of employment used in the Local Plan.

### **Affordable Housing-**

Policy HOUS 1 of the adopted Local Plan expects on-site provision to be provided. The policy seeks 35% affordable housing, or, if appropriate a suitable financial contribution. However, having discussed this particular scheme with the Housing Enabling Team Leader it is considered that the affordable housing contribution could

be dealt with by means of an affordable housing financial contribution. This is mainly because splitting the flats between open market and affordable housing units tends to be problematic in practical and management terms. Having reviewed the application details the Housing Enabling Officer advises that using the average market housing areas listed on drawing 22037 PA 18 (1094.7m<sup>2</sup> - : 13) of 84.2m<sup>2</sup> there would be a requirement to provide £132,173 in affordable housing contributions. This would need to be secured by the completion of a section 106 agreement.

### **Effect on Heritage Assets-**

The site lies within the Winterborne Steepleton Conservation Area and relates to a grade II listed building and near to other listed buildings including the Grade 1 listed Church of St Michael opposite. As such it is a sensitive site in heritage asset terms. The existing building is of imposing proportions and sits within a mainly open semi-parkland type of setting. It was built about 1870 designed by the architect T. H. Wyatt and built of Portland stone (rock finish) with Ham Stone dressings under clay tile and slate roofs.

Internally, there are extensive changes proposed to convert the building to flats. The Design and Access Statement reads:

*The building will be divided into a mixture of 1 and two bedroom suites which include bathrooms, ensuites, self-contained kitchens and living spaces. This includes part of the stable block which will be a duplex unit. The existing building is already heavily subdivided and we hope that the new scheme will be able to rationalise the layout in order to form some open plan living spaces within the suites and also to make features of existing architectural elements such as fire places thereby revealing the historic fabric. Where facilities are created by combining or dividing spaces any particular features of the house have been noted and retained, either by adjusting the partition layout or re-orientating the room use.*

A detailed Heritage Statement has been submitted. This has been reviewed by the Senior Conservation Officer who has also visited the site. He considers that the treatment of existing openings or the removal of partition walls has been proposed in such a way as to retain the historic interest and legibility of the building. He does comment that the top decorative section of the existing bookcase in the library room should be retained and incorporated into the overall en-suite design where practicable (this would be a matter the subject of a planning condition if listed building consent was granted for the alterations to the building). In terms of the Manor House he sums up as :

*Overall, we consider proposed design alterations, to the existing ground, first and second floor floorplan, to be appropriate in both intention and approach with regard proposed interventions within broader context of the principal house. Furthermore, it is considered that in each instance, where the loss of historic fabric is considered likely, a clear and considered justification has been demonstrated that promotes a pragmatic, low-impact approach, with regard the highest retention level of historic fabric, to realise the maximum possible potential for the proposed extent of each suite.*



Turning to the former Coach House and Stable Block he comments:

*Proposals broadly comprise the removal of modern partitions, to better realise the original, open plan nature of the space, and the replacement of modern windows and door with timber framed, double glazed units. Within the specific context of the application, we consider these works to be appropriate and perceive them to offer a tangible degree of enhancement.*

The alterations to the Manor House and to the Coach House/Stables would result in less than substantial harm to their character; it is considered that the benefits of securing the long-term future of the listed buildings, the removal of inappropriate internal works, the enhancement/reinstatement of architectural features proposed, together with the provision of the affordable housing financial contribution would provide sufficient clear and convincing justification in respect of public benefits that would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the buildings.

In terms of the car parking aspect, there are car parking areas to the wider frontage area of the building and in an attached courtyard area. The existing care home use would include 32 patients and about 10 staff. The proposed use, if fully carried out, could involve about 26 residents and about 8 staff. Whilst the care home residents are less likely to have owned cars at the site, they would likely have had visitors and as such, there would likely be similar numbers to those currently using the site. As such the effect on the setting of the listed buildings and on the Winterborne Steepleton Conservation Area is likely to be similar to that at present.

Although this application is treated effectively as residential flats, it is worth noting that there are no proposals to sub-divide the grounds into private gardens. If there were any plans the LPA would have control over this as it would require planning permission (means of enclosure within the curtilage of listed building).

Consideration has been given to sections 66 and 72 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in reaching a view on this application. The scheme is considered to preserve the conservation area.

#### **Effect on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty-**

The site lies within the designated National Landscape, otherwise known as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Given that the changes are largely internal, and that mainly existing car parking areas would be retained for use, it is considered the use would not harm the character or special qualities of the AONB.

#### **Effect on residential amenity-**

The site is a fairly “contained” one with quite extensive outdoor areas/grounds. It is likely the proposed use would involve more outdoor activity and use than the existing. However, the generous space available lends itself to use as communal gardens. It is hence considered that the scheme is acceptable in residential amenity terms.

#### **Ecological considerations-**

The scheme is essentially a change of use such that there is minimal external change that would impact “physical” ecological assets. Hence no biodiversity plan was required in this case. The Council’s Ecologist confirmed this on the pre-application submission.

Regarding nutrient neutrality considerations- In accordance with Regulation 63 of the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 an Appropriate Assessment has been carried out due to the sites potential effect on the Poole Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar. This concludes that the scheme will not have a significant effect on this SPA/Ramsar. It concludes that there is a likely decrease in the occupancy of the building and therefore a likely decrease in the nitrogen and phosphorous discharges. Water efficiency measures may also result in a decrease in nutrient discharges. Hence the nutrient neutrality regime would not increase nutrient output relative to the authorised care home use.

### **Flood-risk-**

Regarding flood-risk about 37% of the site area (including the buildings) lies in flood zone 3 (high risk), with about 3% in flood zone 2 (medium risk).

The Environment Agency objection set out in the letter of 9/8/23 states:

*Flats 1 - 6 have direct internal connectivity to the lift and lobby stairwell, so occupants could escape to the first-floor landing, but they would not have access to any private (self-contained access within their own home) internal safe haven. Flat 8 does have internal self-contained first floor safe haven, but Flat 7 does not have any access to an upper floor refuge. We maintain that if the building is to be subdivided, it should be done in such a way as to provide two storey dwellings, so each individual dwelling has an internal self-contained first floor safe haven in line with that provided for flat 8, with no ground floor self-contained dwellings provided. Based on the current flood risk evidence we would not support self-contained ground floor dwellings.*

Only one ground floor unit (unit 7) does not have a first floor refuge.

The applicant has submitted a flood-risk assessment (FRA). Following earlier comments from the Environment Agency (EA) and the Flood Risk Management Team (FRM) this has been further revised (GeoSmart FRA dated 18/7/23), and subsequently revised by a final FRA dated 2/11/23 which clarified existing and proposed site levels and finished floor levels.

This final FRA states that:

*minimum finished floor levels are noted at 91.04mAOD. During a 1 in 100 year plus 47% climate change allowance fluvial event the flood level at site is 91.13AOD. During this event, flood depths in the development area could be up to 0.21m with up to 9cm anticipated in the building.*

The EA maintain their objection because they consider the proposed development provides insufficient flood-risk mitigation to keep the development dry for its lifetime. However, they acknowledge that the existing (recent use) and proposed development is in the same Flood Risk Vulnerability Class.

There are a number of ground floor bedrooms (albeit less than in the existing use). Mitigation by raising the floor levels is not practicable in this instance because these are listed buildings.

The EA letter of 24/11/23, whilst maintaining its objection acknowledges that the circumstances are unusual and nuanced:

*Further to our previous responses, we acknowledge that the existing and proposed development is in the same flood risk vulnerability classification. Also, that there appears to be less ground floor bedrooms proposed than existing and that there are likely to be other constraints to be considered in this change of use application, for example Heritage Assets. As such, this proposal comes with a unique set of issues that will need to be balanced by the Local Planning Authority, including flood risk. However, we would like to reiterate that raising internal ground floor levels to above design flood level and providing an internal self-contained first floor to each dwelling is our preferential solution to flood risk mitigation in change of use applications. Therefore, if the LPA believe this mitigation is possible in this situation, then this should be delivered to provide a safe dry development.*

*The updated FRA offers some additional information over the previous version with regards estimated fluvial flood levels and potential internal flood depths within the buildings. The estimated fluvial flooding design event depth of 0.09m may be relatively shallow, however, since the FRA proposes only very limited flood mitigation measures, it is considered that there is insufficient flood risk mitigation proposed to keep the development dry to the design flood level.*

In a subsequent section the letter goes on to state;

*As it stands the FRA does not currently demonstrate that the development would remain dry for the development lifetime incorporating allowances for climate change (ie insufficient flood risk mitigation to keep the development dry to the design flood level).*

*However, if the LPA determine that other material considerations outweigh Flood risk then please make sure that the LPA are satisfied that access/egress are safe.*

Following this the Case Officer has written to the EA on 11/12/23 indicating the assessment of the flood-risk issue and the “planning balance” as set out below:

*This is a situation where, as previously indicated, the existing use includes ground floor bedrooms for vulnerable largely bed-bound, elderly occupiers. Replacing these with self-contained residential units for in essence “active” occupiers would in practical terms result in less vulnerable occupiers. Furthermore, the nature of this use would include a concierge/night manager - adding a further layer of potential safety as they could alert any guests in the event of potential flood.*

*Due to the grade II listed status and related constraints it is not possible to raise the floor levels. As you rightly acknowledge - this scheme has a unique set of planning issues to be judged in the planning balance, with flooding being one such issue.*

*In considering this scheme I am mindful of the following points;*

*-If flooding does occur the submitted indications from the revised FRA indicate a depth of up to 9cm; in flooding terms this is a shallow depth and as such is unlikely to pose serious risk to human life; well within the Flood Risk Assessment Guidance for New Development (FD2320) -which indicates there will be no danger to people for flood depths below 0.3m;*

*-The first floor “refuge” is a viable safe option; pertinent to bear in mind that a flood level is likely to be shallow at 9cm maximum (ground floor), and that the building is structurally stable.*

*-Emergency rescue (first floor) - aided by 2 stairways in different locations;*

*-"Escape" to first floor level is feasible for all ground floor units except suite 7 (Coach House). However, certain flood risk mitigation measures can be taken here; it is proposed to install measures on the following lines:*

*Two of the external doors to the coach house are the main entrance to the suite and so a high threshold here would not be practical for the day to day function however they could have an internally applied demountable flood barrier board. Effectively these are two channels applied to the internal side of the door frame that has a board slid into place if it were to flood. This would prevent any water ingress into the suite at all even during a worst case scenario. The building is to be centrally managed so the management would be able to fit the boards if they saw an increase in flood water. Furthermore, this would then not be visible externally. Alternatively, this type of system could be applied to all the doors of this suite rather than raising any of the thresholds. The above alteration can be required by means of a planning condition.*

*-Access/egress - multiple points of access and egress are present on this building and included in the proposed scheme;*

*-Ground water flooding - not raised as a significant issue by the LLFA (FRM Team).*

*Water efficiency - The applicant also intends to incorporate water efficiency measures. Although the scheme is not new development, a large amount of the plumbing and heating systems are being overhauled to accommodate the new scheme. The new system will be up to more modern standards which includes improved efficiency.*

*This will be achieved through the provision of efficient water fittings throughout the building, including aerated taps, service valves complete with flow restrictors, (also helping to reduce hot water demand), dual flush toilets, new showers and low water consumption appliances where provided. Using the fittings approach for compliance, the consumption of wholesome water will be no more than 125 litres/person/day, using this fitting approach. The maximum fitting consumption will not exceed the below, as Building Regulation Approved Document G (2015):*

- WC: 6/4 litres dual flush or 4.5 litres single flush.*
- Shower: 10 litres/minute.*
- Bath: 185 litres.*
- Basin Taps: 6 litres/minute.*
- Sink Taps: 8 litres/minute.*
- Domestic Dishwasher: 1.25 l/place setting.*
- Domestic Washing Machine: 8.17 l/kilogram*

*The existing hot and cold water distribution will be renewed throughout the building, which will ensure no leakage from older pipework and fittings.*

*The incoming mains cold water supply will be provided with a water sub-meter, which will be connected to a new building management system (BMS). The BMS will record and monitor water consumption on a regular basis and will detect higher than normal flowrates.*

*- A Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan dated 27/10/23 has been provided. Such a Plan can be specified by planning condition.*

#### *Other Relevant Planning Considerations-*

*-The existing building fabric of this impressive listed building has suffered from the “institutionalised” internal works; this scheme includes a variety of largely internal alterations which would help restore and enhance the historic character and features of this listed building;*

*-Potential employment created by catering for the guests on-site -*

- 1x Receptionist (full time)*
- 2x Cleaners/housekeeping (part time)*
- 2x Maintenance/grounds people (part time)*
- 2x Chef and associated kitchen staff (full time)*
- 1x Concierge (full time)*
- 1x Site Manager (full time)*
- 1x Beauty therapist (part time)*
- 1x Bar staff (part time)*

The final reply from the EA dated 21/12/23 (having seen the above Case Officer letter) maintains their objection. Within this letter they comment:

*We welcome the use of the flood barrier boards to Suite 7’s external doors, however this may not be sufficient on its own to ensure a dry development due to the potential of permeability of the existing walls or floors. We also welcome any flood mitigation measures that can be provided to any of the buildings that would help ensure a dry development, however we understood from the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) that this was not possible.*

The Councils Flood Risk Management Team (Lead Local flood Authority) have had involvement throughout this application and are content with the surface water and ground water aspects of the scheme, but are “backing up” the EA in their objection to the fluvial flood risk aspect.

To summarise the key reasons why this change of use is considered acceptable, there would be less ground floor bedrooms than with the authorised care home use, the occupiers are less likely to be vulnerable occupiers, there are first floor refuges available for all but one unit (suite 7 covered above) and the flooding, if it occurred, would be to a likely maximum of 9cm depth (not a depth which, as the Environment agency concede, is a danger to life).

It is also worth noting that the building is currently empty. Whilst it is not known if another care home operator would take it on, it has not been marketed as such, it seems unlikely for the reasons given by Social Services and doing so may actually be worse in respect of evacuation measures in the event of a flood bearing in mind a care home use would involve, by definition, more vulnerable persons.

The building is a grade II listed and may remain empty and unused if an alternative use to the care home use cannot be secured. Whilst no information has been submitted with regards to marketing of the property for alternative uses and no evidence has been submitted that an alternative use could not be made of the building, given its listed status finding a viable use would be of benefit to this designated heritage asset and its long-term protection.

In the light of the foregoing it is considered that the scheme is acceptable in flood risk terms subject to conditions which would include flood barriers to Unit 7 and a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan and other flood resilience measures.

### **Highways-**

The scheme has an existing vehicular access and scope for about 22 cars parking- possibly more- in the gravelled wide frontage area and western courtyard area. There is ample turning space on-site. The Highways Officer has been consulted and has no objection to the scheme. It is considered that the scale and nature of traffic associated with the proposed use is acceptable.

### **Comments on Parish Council/Third Party letters-**

There are comments about regretting the loss of the care home. However, as stated in the above report:

*the relatively small size, rural location, coupled with the constraints of the historic layout of the listed building does not lend itself particularly well towards catering for residential care. Furthermore, there is no adopted Local Plan policy seeking to retain care homes.*

Whilst it is possible the employment suggested with this use may not transpire, the scheme nevertheless has the planning benefit of ensuring a beneficial economic use for a currently vacant listed building, and also provides an opportunity to restore more architectural interest to the interior by removing the “institutionalised” works.

Comments are made regarding the potential pollution and ecological impacts of lighting; this can be conditioned to control any external lighting changes on the site. Comments have been made regarding possible parking encroaching onto the lawned grounds of the site. A condition can be used to prevent this.

## **17.0 Conclusion**

The principle of this use is acceptable on this edge of defined development boundary location given that the site is approximately 100m from the defined development boundary and would ensure the listed building’s long-term use and maintenance by bringing the building back into use. In visual terms there would be little change as the application is mainly focussed on internal alterations with car parking largely utilising existing parking areas. The scheme would have an acceptable relationship with adjacent development in residential amenity terms. Regarding flood risk, the

authorised care home use had more ground floor bedrooms than the proposed scheme and the use falls within the same flood risk vulnerability class as the former care home use. This, together with the scheme design and additional flood resilience measures helps mitigate flood risk dangers. Furthermore, in terms of heritage assets, the less than substantial harm is outweighed by the public benefits of a beneficial economic use. The scheme includes beneficial internal works to the listed buildings and it would preserve the character of the conservation area. Hence the scheme is considered acceptable in the context of the Local Plan policies and central government advice referenced in this report.

## **18.0 Recommendation**

### **Recommendation A:**

Delegate authority to the Head of Planning and the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement to approve subject to:

- a) satisfactory outcome of referral to Secretary of State (due to Environment Agency objection);
- b) Completion of a legal agreement under section 106 agreement of the town and country planning act 1990 (as amended) in a form to be agreed by the legal services manager to secure an affordable housing financial contribution (£132,173); and
- c) Subject to the following Planning Conditions:

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

Location and block plan 22037 PA 01B  
Proposed ground floor plan 22037 PA 18E  
Proposed ground floor plan 22037 PA 18F (levels)  
Proposed first floor plan 22037 PA 19 E  
Proposed second floor plan 22037 PA 20D  
Proposed roof plan 22037 PA 21  
Proposed suite 1 22037 PA 22  
Proposed suite 2 22037 PA 23  
Proposed suite 3 22037 PA 24  
Proposed suite 4 22037 PA 25  
Proposed suite 5 22037 PA 26  
Proposed suite 6 22037 PA 27  
Proposed suite 7 22037 PA 28  
Proposed suite 8 22037 PA 29  
Proposed suite 9 22037 PA 30  
Proposed suite 10 22037 PA 31  
Proposed suite 11 22037 PA 32  
Proposed suite 12 22037 PA 33  
Proposed suite 13 22037 PA 34  
Proposed windows 22037 PA 35  
Proposed parking plan 22037 PA 39A  
Proposed stable door 22037 PA 40A

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

2. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

3. The relevant suites in the Coach House/Stables shall not first be occupied for residential use until the replacement windows and door have first been altered in accordance with the approved drawings 22037 PA 35 and 22037 PA 40A. The windows/door shall be finished in a light cream colour to match the existing unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the character of the listed building is protected.

4. Before the development hereby approved is first occupied or utilised the turning and parking shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plan 22037 PA 39A. Thereafter, these areas must be permanently maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified. The vehicle parking area shall be confined to the enclosed (walled) frontage courtyard area and linked courtyard area to the west only.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site in the interest of highway safety and to protect the character of the conservation area.

5. The development shall be carried out and managed in accordance with the submitted GeoSmart Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan dated 17/10/23.

Reason: To ensure there are appropriate measures in place to minimise risk to occupiers.

6. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the GeoSmart Flood Risk Assessment dated 2/11/23 (excluding any landscaping/ground-raising).

Reason: To minimise flood-risk.

7. Suite 7 (Coach House) shall not be first occupied until flood prevention measures based on alterations to accommodate raised power socket locations, internally applied demountable flood barrier boards and an internal tanking membrane to the unit have first been installed in accordance with details which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved measures shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: To minimise flood-risk.

8. No residential unit hereby approved shall be first occupied until a detailed scheme to enable the charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe,



accessible locations within the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The agreed details shall be implemented and made operational prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby approved. Such facilities shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made to enable users of the development to be able to charge their plug-in and ultra-low emission vehicles.

9. Details of measures to limit the water use of the dwelling(s) in accordance with the optional requirement in regulation 36(2)(b) and the Approved Document for Part G2 of the Building Regulations 2010 (or any equivalent regulation revoking and/or re-enacting that Statutory Instrument) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the dwellings are occupied. The submitted details shall include a water consumption calculation for each dwelling in accordance with the Approved Documents referred to above. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to occupation and maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure nutrient neutrality in the Poole Harbour catchment in the interests of protected habitats.

10. Prior to commencement of work on the site, a lighting scheme which reflects the need to avoid harm to protected species and to minimise light spill, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There shall be no lighting of the site other than in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of minimising light pollution on the character of the area and in the interests of preserving biodiversity.

### **Recommendation B:**

Refuse planning permission for the reason set out below if the S106 legal agreement is not completed by 31<sup>st</sup> September 2024, or such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning.

1. The scheme requires an off-site affordable housing financial contribution (£132,172). In the absence of a completed S106 agreement to secure the affordable housing contribution the proposal is contrary to policy HOUS1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015 and the NPPF (2023).