

Application Number:	P/FUL/2024/04104
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Land South Of Athelhampton Road Puddletown
Proposal:	Erect 28 dwellings including access, parking, landscaping & associated infrastructure and ancillary works
Applicant name:	Lewis Wyatt (Construction) Ltd
Case Officer:	Ollie Brewer-Hughes
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Parker

1. **Reason application is going to committee:** In accordance with the Scheme of Delegation as the Officer recommendation is in conflict with the Parish Council's response and this is application is a Major.

2. **Summary of recommendation:**

GRANT subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report

To delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Northern Area Manager to

- A) grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure:

- An offsite contribution to affordable housing
- The nutrient neutrality mitigation
- Viability mechanism
- Option to transfer the Parish Council or management company the Public Open Space

Or

B) Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below if the S106 agreement is not completed by 6 months of the date of the permission or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Northern Area Manager. The reasons for refusal for failure to secure the necessary obligations are set out in full at the end of this report.

3. **Key planning issues**

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	The application site is allocated in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan for housing for 22 dwellings. The proposal is for 28 dwellings on a slightly larger site area than the allocation however principally it is considered that this location could support 6 additional dwellings given its position on the edge of

Issue	Conclusion
	Puddletown.
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	The proposed design responds well to the locality and the layout has been designed to ensure that the scheme is not overly dominated by private car parking. The design also provides suitable buffers to the surrounding landscape to ensure that the edge to the landscape beyond the site is softened.
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	The proposed development would ensure that all dwellings are compliant with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) and suitable private gardens would be provided for most units that would not be unacceptably overlooked. The proposed apartments at plots 1-4 would have access to a communal garden located to the rear of these plots and the two proposed flats over garages would not have their own separate garden however they would have access to the public open space proposed on the opposite side of the main street and for recreational purposes there are a number of public rights of way, including Hardy's Way, located in close proximity to the site. The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of any existing neighbouring dwellings.
Impact on heritage assets	The development would likely result in less than substantial harm to the setting of nearby Grade II* Listed Ilington House due to the erosion of some of the rural setting of the heritage asset. There also likely would be less than substantial harm to The Schoolhouse / The Chapel / The Manse (Nos. 1-3 Athelhampton Road) which are situated adjacent to the site. There would likely be no identifiable harm to the Puddletown Conservation Area or non-designated heritage assets Nos. 4, 6 and 7 Athelhampton Road). The identified less than substantial harm is outweighed by the public benefits of the development.
Flood risk and drainage	The development would have a suitable drainage strategy and the flood risk to the site is compatible with the proposed development. The foul drainage details would also be considered acceptable.
Economic benefits	Contribution to the local economy through the addition of 28 dwellings and temporary benefits during construction through local employment and spending in the local economy. The development would provide a contribution towards offsite affordable housing of £72,165 which would be below

Issue	Conclusion
	the policy compliant level.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	Offsite highways improvements are proposed to ensure safe access and egress and sufficient parking would be provided for the site. The highway impact of the proposal in terms of highway safety and trip generation would be acceptable.
Nutrient Neutrality	An offsite bespoke scheme would ensure nutrient neutrality would be achieved as detailed in the HRA and secured in a Legal Agreement.
Biodiversity	The site would achieve more than the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on-site if this application is approved.

4. Description of site

The application site is located off Athlehampton Road on the edge of Puddletown. The application site currently forms agricultural land. The application site is located on the edge of the Puddletown Conservation Area. The landscape surrounding the application site is relatively flat to the north, east and west but it gradually rises to the south particularly towards Little Knoll Copse which is situated approximately 50m from the site.

5. Description of development

The application site in consideration is seeking full planning permission for the construction of 28 dwellings.

6. Background and relevant planning history

None Relevant to Application

7. List of constraints

Puddletown Conservation Area - Distance: 8m (situated north of the site)

Poole Harbour Nutrient Catchment Area

Land Outside Defined Development Boundary

Policy ENV 3; Land of Local Landscape Importance; Land at Ilsington House and the Village Green - Distance: 8m

Landscape Character area - Chalk Valley and Downland; Cerne and Piddle Valleys and Chalk Downland

Potential groundwater flooding

Site of nature conservation interests (SNCIS): SY79/018 - Little Knoll Copse; - Distance: 52.51 (situated to the south of the site)

8. Consultations

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

Consultees

Natural England: No Objection – subject to mitigation being secured

- Your appropriate assessment concludes that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question.

- Having considered the assessment and supporting information, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified potential adverse effects that might occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England advises that we agree with the assessment conclusions.
- Any permission must ensure all the agreed measures designed to avoid harm to the designated sites are completed in full and thereafter maintained.

Historic England:

- The application site is located close to Ilsington House (Grade II* Listed)
- There is a tree belt that provides a substantial and relatively historic visual buffer between gardens of Ilsington House and its agricultural hinterland during the summer months. However, in the winter months this buffer will be more visually permeable particularly to lighting at night
- Longer views from Ilsington House are currently of open landscape on three sides
- The proposal would bring development eastwards enclosing the garden to the south which would alter the historic relationship between the house and village
- There has already been some encroachment of this due to the village surgery being constructed on a stretch of previously undeveloped land adjacent to the application site
- The proposals will have no physical impact on the deserted medieval village at Bardolfeston
- There would be glimpses of views from Bardolfeston to the application site particularly in winter due to the loss of vegetation cover and increased use of street lighting. The extension of the village would also impact on the rurality of the monument however the impact is limited
- The use of high quality, natural and locally appropriate materials, the careful orientation and positioning of the built form, considered and minimal external lighting and extensive landscaping will be critical in reducing the visual impact of this development on the setting of Ilsington House.
- Both impacts would be less than substantial and on the lower end of the scale of harm that is less than substantial

DC Archaeology: Since the results of this evaluation were effectively negative, I advise that archaeology is not a constraint that needs to be taken into account when this application is determined.

DC Conservation & Design Officer: No Objection

- There are no designated heritage assets identified within the immediate extent of the site thus proposals are not considered to impact directly (physically) on the fabric of any encompassing assets
- Varying degrees of impact likely within the villagescape and therefore the setting encompassing designated and non-designated heritage assets
- We note that the application's red line extent formally conforms to the intentions of a site allocation extent associated with *housing* and *community* as identified within the 2019 – 2031 Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan as *Chapel Ground* (Map 7, pp. 35). Predicated on the extents approved land use, we have no objection to the principle of development in this area.
- Likely resultant less than substantial harm to the significance of identified encompassing heritage assets

- It is considered the benefits of the scheme would outweigh the identified harm
- Proposal will impact the following heritage assets:

	Grade	No harm	Less than substantial harm	Substantial harm
Ilslington House (1324049)	II*		<u>X</u>	
The Schoolhouse/ The Chapel/ The Manse (Nos. 1-3 Athelhampton Road)	ND		<u>X</u>	
Nos. 4, 6 and 7 Athelhampton Road)	ND	<u>X</u>		
Puddletown Conservation Area		<u>X</u>		

DC Environmental Assessment:

- HRA Prepared based on nutrient details submitted on 28 May 2026

DC Economic Development and Tourism: No Objection

- We fully support this application as it will provide valuable jobs in the construction industry

DC Environmental Protection:

- No information provided in regard to the effect of noise on the nearby environment from proposed plant. Either it should be confirmed the proposed complies with MCS or a noise assessment would be required (BS4142 assessment would be appropriate)
- The arrangements for foul water disposal should be clarified and whether septic tanks would be required. If so the Environment Agency would need to be made aware
- A Construction Environment Management Plan is recommended

DC Highways: No Objection

Comments Received June 2026: No Objections

- The site is located within a sustainable village location, with opportunities to access local facilities. A school, convenience store, village hall and GP surgery are all within approximately 800m (around a 10-minute walk), with recreational facilities slightly further away but still within reasonable walking distance.
- The site is also served by nearby bus stops and offers opportunities for cycling, providing access to both local and wider destinations.
- The development is predicted to generate approximately 12 two way vehicle movements in peak hours. Junction modelling confirms the access, and vehicular movements can be accommodated within capacity with negligible delay or queuing.
- The development proposals include a package of off-site highway improvements to mitigate the impact of the development. These measures will deliver betterment for existing and future users
- The proposed uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points are considered acceptable given the relatively low level of vehicular traffic associated with the development and the modest number of pedestrian movements anticipated.

- The internal layout has been designed in accordance with guidance, comprising of a primary access road with a carriageway width of approximately 5.5m, leading to a series of cul-de-sacs, parking courts and shared surface areas.
- The layout incorporates footways where there is frontage development and provides a permeable network of pedestrian routes linking across the site and to external connections. Overall, the geometry is considered appropriate for residential environment, and a refuse collection vehicle can turn on site in a forward gear demonstrated by a swept path analysis.
- Any shared surface areas will need to have due regard for Inclusive Mobility with pedestrian facilities and provide tactile paving at crossing areas.
- The submitted parking layout plan demonstrates provision for a total of 75 parking spaces. This equates to an overall average of approximately 2.7 spaces per dwelling.
- The proposed off-site highway works, including the formation of the new primary access onto Athelhampton Road and associated pedestrian and secondary access connections, will be secured and delivered through a Section 278 Agreement with the Highway Authority.

DC Housing Enabling:

- The development would be better served providing a greater mix of affordable houses with less reliance on flats and apartments. This will help to create a balanced and sustainable development and will allow the affordable dwellings to be more pepper-potted around the site.
- The affordable housing statement proposes a tenure split of 8 rented and one intermediate dwelling which is acceptable. There are currently only two 3 bedroom affordable homes proposed on this site. These should both be provided as rented accommodation.

DC Local Lead Flood Authority: No Objection

- The documentation provides the necessary information required for the LLFA not to object to the proposed development subject to the conditions and informatives
- Overall the flood risk to the site is compatible with the proposed development

DC Public Transport:

- We are pleased that public transport has been considered for this location and Bus Shelters and stopping places have been included in the design. We suggest the developer makes contact with Dorset Council's Public Transport Team at busstops@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk at a suitable point to discuss the shelter type and manufacturer as we have a 'standard bus stop' design which improves continuity from an ongoing maintenance and cleaning program.

Crime Prevention Officer:

- Recommend that the security and layout of the development meets the standards laid out in the Secured By Design Homes Guide 2024 www.securedbydesign.com including the integrated bike store next to Plot 9.
- Also that all gates that lead to the rear of dwellings are key lockable from both sides as the majority of burglaries occur at the rear of premises.
- I note that there are parking bays located at the rear of dwellings. Parking layouts such as this are discouraged as they introduce access to the rear of houses and such areas are often unlit which can increase the fear of crime and can encourage anti-social behaviour. Where parking such as this is necessary then they should be within view of active rooms such as kitchen and living rooms and not from private rooms such as bedrooms and bathrooms. Communal parking should be lit to the relevant levels as recommended by BS 5489:1:2020

Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue:

- At this stage of the application Dorset & Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service is required to make comment relating to section B5 of Approved Document B. Essentially, this relates to the provision of reasonable facilities to assist fire fighters within the building and enable fire appliances to gain access to the building. Complying with these requirements, in advance of the formal Building Regulations consultation process, will assist with the process and are made without prejudice to it.

Puddletown Area Parish Council: No Objection (September 2024)

- Puddletown Area Parish Council have no objection to this application.

Response March 2026 following Viability Report: Objection

- Conflict with Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan through no on-site affordable housing provision
- Failure to deliver housing that meets local needs
- Undermining the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan site allocation
- Preference for on-site affordable housing provision

Representations Received:

It should be noted that multiple representations of objection were received from the same household therefore these representations have been considered as one representation.

Summary of Objections Received (1x Representation Received):

- The application documents (namely the heritage statement prepared by Forum heritage are deficient
- The application does not conform with the Development Plan and there are no material considerations justifying departure from the Development Plan
- The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the public benefits of the Proposed Development outweigh the harm to the nearby heritage assets
- Lack of notification of this application
- Boundary of the proposed development extends into the boundary of Ilsington House

Summary of Comments Received (3x Representation Received)

- No objection subject to the access track discussed pre-planning that would run alongside the cul-de-sac being provided to ensure access to the site if there was a collision by where the development adjoins Athelhampton Road.
- Impact to cemetery should be considered

9. 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.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

10. 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
- ENV9 - Pollution and contaminated land
- ENV10 - The landscape and townscape setting
- ENV 12 - The design and positioning of buildings
- ENV13 - Achieving High Levels of Environmental Performance
- ENV15 - Efficient and Appropriate Use of Land
- ENV 16 - Amenity
- SUS2 - Distribution of development
- HOUS6 - Other residential development outside DDB's
- COM7 - Creating a safe & efficient transport network
- COM9 - Parking provision
- COM10 - The Provision of Utilities Service Infrastructure

Made Neighbourhood Plans:

Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan (Made June 2021)

Policy 3 – Village Character

Policy 4 – Respecting the History of Puddletown

Policy 5 – Design

Policy 6 – Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Policy 7 – European and Internationally Protected Sites

Policy 8 – Flood Risk

Policy 10 – The scale and location of new housing development in Puddletown

Policy 11 – House Types

Policy 12 – Housing & Community Uses site allocation: Land at Athelhampton Rd

Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Waste Plan 2019

Policy 22 - Waste from new developments

Other Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework:

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development plan proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless specific NPPF policies protecting areas or assets provide a strong reason for refusal and/or any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, with particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes.

Other relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4 'Decision making': Para 39 - 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' This outlines the government's objective in respect of land supply with subsection 'Rural housing' at paragraphs 82-84 reflecting the requirement for development in rural areas.
- Section 6 'Building a strong, competitive economy', paragraphs 88 and 89 'Supporting a prosperous rural economy' promotes the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, through conversion of existing buildings, the erection of well-designed new buildings, and supports sustainable tourism and leisure developments where identified needs are not met by existing rural service centres.
- Section 11 'Making effective use of land'
- Section 12 'Achieving well designed places' This indicates that all development to be of a high quality in design, and the relationship and visual impact of it to be compatible with the surroundings. In particular, and amongst other things, Paragraphs 131 – 141 advise that:
The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.
Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.
- Section 14 'Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change'
- Section 15 'Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment'- In National Landscapes (formerly known as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty), paragraph 189 requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty. Decisions in Heritage Coast areas should be consistent with the special character of the area and the importance of its conservation (para 191). Paragraphs 192-195 set out how biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.

- Section 16 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment'- Paragraph 212 says that when considering designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account (para 216).

National Planning Practice Guidance

Emerging local plans:

Paragraph 49 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

The Dorset Council Local Plan Options consultation took place between January and March 2021, with further consultation between 18 Aug – 31 October 2025. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the relevant policies in the draft plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision making.

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

The Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy identifies local priorities for nature recovery and maps areas where action would be most beneficial. In planning decisions it is a material consideration, helping to ensure that development supports biodiversity enhancement and aligns with Dorset's agreed priorities for nature recovery.

All of Dorset:

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.

Housing land supply

Dorset Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply as required by National Policy. In addition, the strategies for meeting housing needs in the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the housing need under the Government's standard method and therefore, in accordance with NPPF footnote 8, the housing policies within the adopted Development Plan(s) are out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. The emerging Dorset Local Plan is not sufficiently progressed and can be afforded very limited weight in decision making.

Housing Delivery Test (HDT)

The latest HDT results (2023 measurement) show that enough homes have been delivered within the local plan area to demonstrate 106% of the target.

11. 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. 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 vehicular access to the proposed properties has been carefully considered by Officers and amendments were sought to ensure that there would be sufficient turning space to allow vehicles to enter/exit parking spaces easily.
- Consideration was given to ensure that the proposed offsite and onsite works provided suitable pedestrian crossings that were accessible through the use of appropriate dropped kerbs

13. Public Benefits

The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These are summarised in the table below:

Off-site contribution to affordable housing

Spending in the local economy as a result of the development

CIL contributions

14. Planning Assessment

14.1 Principle of Development:

The site falls outside the settlement boundary of Puddletown however the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan (NP) under Policy 12 allocates the application site for the construction of about 18-22 dwellings. The application site in consideration is located predominately within the allocation area however the site area extends beyond the allocation with the area behind nos.4-7 Athlehampton Road. On this basis, it is considered that principally housing in this location would be considered broadly acceptable.

The part of the proposed development that would be outside of the defined development boundary for Puddletown does not form part of any defined allocations. Therefore, whilst this may in part conflict with the spatial strategy of the Local Plan set out in Policy SUS2 which seeks to direct new housing to the most sustainable locations within development boundaries where there is ready access to services allowing for modes of transport other than the private car to be used day to day, it must be considered whether the dwellings outside of the allocation area would be

considered to be in an unsustainable location. In this instance, there is a footpath that runs adjacent to Athelhampton that extends into Puddletown which would allow walkable access to facilities such as the Doctors Surgery, Convenience Store, Library, First and Middle Schools. A bus stop is proposed to serve the site. Currently the village is served by two bus routes that connect the village to Dorchester and the surrounding areas. Therefore, the location of the development allows for options other than the private car to be utilised. The private car may be used for some further away journeys however the location of the site close to a range of services and facilities which would minimise their number. Paragraph 110 of the Framework acknowledges that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural locations.

Therefore, it is considered that the dwellings that would be outside of the allocation would not be situated in a location that would be considered unsustainable. Principally therefore, this would be considered acceptable.

Policy 12 of the NP does not impose an absolute limit on the amount of development that would be acceptable. The level of harm that would result from the additional site area and number of dwellings. The Neighbourhood Plan was made on the 21st June 2021. After 21 June this year, the Neighbourhood Plan will not benefit from the provisions of Paragraph 14 of the NPPF which states that where the tilted balance under paragraph 11(d) applies and a Neighbourhood Plan has been made and became part of the development plan within the last 5 years, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Further, there are material consideration that need to be considered such as the 5-year housing land supply that will be discussed in the following sections.

Further to this, Policy 12 includes specific requirements for the development to adhere to. A summary of the requirements is set out below:

- a) The type and size of dwellings accords with Policy 11, with at least 35% of the homes provided as genuinely affordable dwellings.
- b) An area within the site of at least 0.2ha, located at the junction of Athelhampton Road and Milom Lane, is made available for community use, with the transfer of land to an appropriate community body completed prior to the occupation of the first dwelling. Any building within this area would need to respect the potential inter-relationship with the Grade II* Ilsington Manor to the north, and the surgery building to the west.
- c) Vehicular access will be provided directly off Athelhampton Road, with the junction designed to create adequate visibility to allow safe access / egress and to help slow traffic entering the village. An off-road east-west link for the Tolpuddle Martyrs Trail should be incorporated within the layout, and financial contributions will be required to improve pedestrian / cycle links into the village, to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority and in line with the aspirations set out in Policy 15.
- d) A drainage plan is secured to manage groundwater and surface water disposal from the site to the satisfaction of the Lead Local Flood Authority, in accordance with Policy 8. Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan: 2019 – 2031.
- e) A combined landscape strategy and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan is agreed with the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 6 and 7.
- f) The scale, design and layout of the buildings should respect the character of the village as set out in Policies 3 to 5 and the setting of the Conservation Area

g) An area of land of at least 600m² is provided for allotments (or for an alternative recreational use in agreement with the Parish Council) in a suitable location within easy walking distance (1km) of the site.

h) Any net new residential development will need to avoid giving rise to any adverse impacts on the integrity of Poole Harbour (a European site);

i) A comprehensive heritage strategy is agreed with the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with Policy 4.

In response to the above, the development would provide the following:

- a) This is assessed below in the affordable housing section. Due to viability considerations the development cannot provide 35% affordable housing onsite but can provide an offsite contribution of £72,165.
- b) The development proposes the provision of 0.3ha of public open space including a play area. The Applicants have confirmed that they are happy to include a cascade mechanism in the Legal Agreement for the transfer of the central public open space (excluding SuD's) area to the Parish Council as a land transfer agreement only. It is therefore considered that this would satisfy criterion (b).
- c) Vehicular access would be provided off Athlehampton Road. Further details of this are set out below within the Highways section of the report.

The neighbourhood plan proposes an east-west footpath running to the south of the site. The development proposes a footpath connection running east to west which would adjoin with Milom Lane where an uncontrolled crossing would be installed. A crossing would also be provided across Athlehampton Road which would provide a connection to a path proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan that would go to the east of Ilsington House.

In terms of contributions, the Highways Authority have not requested any contributions in relation to this application however offsite improvement works have been proposed as part of this application with works being carried out to provide bus stops on both sides of Athlehampton Road and uncontrolled crossing across Milom Lane and Athlehampton Road. The existing footway that runs in front of the site would also be widened and a shared cycle and pedestrian footway would be provided along the front of the development. These measures would be secured by a planning condition. On this basis, this criterion would be satisfied.

- d) Details of the drainage strategy are set out in the below report. The LLFA raise no objection, and a suitable drainage strategy has been provided.
- e) Details of the proposed landscaping and biodiversity enhancements and mitigation are set out below.
- f) Consideration of the design is set out below.
- g) The applicant engaged with the Parish Council on this matter prior to submitting the application however, no specific requirement was confirmed and no allotments are included in the application. A play area has been proposed instead along with an area of public open space which would be 0.3ha in size. This would conflict with criterion (g) which will be addressed further below.
- h) Details of an acceptable nutrient neutrality scheme proposed have been set out below.

- i) A comprehensive heritage assessment was submitted as part of this application. Further assessment of the impact to heritage assets is considered below.

Housing Land Supply

Dorset Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply as required by National Policy. The published supply is currently 2.53 years. In addition, the strategies for meeting housing needs in the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the housing need under the Government's standard method and therefore, in accordance with NPPF footnote 8, the housing policies within the adopted Development Plan(s) are out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. The emerging Dorset Local Plan is not sufficiently progressed and can be afforded very limited weight in decision making.

Housing Mix

The proposed housing mix would consist of 2x 1-bed apartments, 4x 2-bed flats, 7x 2-bed dwellinghouses, 10x 3-bed dwellinghouses and 5x 4-bed dwellinghouses. None of the proposed units would be affordable homes following a viability review carried out by the Applicants and subsequently independently reviewed by the District Valuer Service (DVS) at HMRC which concluded that it would be unviable to provide on-site affordable housing. This is discussed further below.

The proposed development would have a density of around 13.3 dwellings per hectare (dph). Policy HOUS 1 of the West Dorset Local Plan sets out that 35% of dwellings should be affordable in West Dorset and Weymouth. Policy 12 of the NP similarly requires this level of affordable housing to be provided. Policy 11 of the NP also sets out that for major development that at least 30% of homes should be 1 and 2 bed dwellings and larger dwellings of 4 bedrooms or more should not exceed 20%. The proposed development would result in 46% being 1 and 2-bedroom properties and 18% of dwellings would have 4-bedrooms. Therefore, the proposal would be considered to be in accordance with Policy 11 of the NP and Policy HOUS 1 of the West Dorset Local Plan in this regard.

14.2 Design, Layout and Visual Impact:

Policy ENV12 (Design) sets out development should be designed to achieve a high quality of sustainable and inclusive design. Proposals for development will be required to justify how the relevant aspects of development form address the relevant design principles and standards.

In respect of Design, Policy 12 of the Neighbourhood Plan sets out that the development should:

- Provide a positive frontage onto Athelhampton Road,
- Be of a mixed design and natural, organic layout and form appropriate to the rural setting and nearby undesignated heritage assets, avoiding multiple detached dwellings, executive styling and uniform placement and orientation of buildings and streets.
- Buildings are kept below the 64m contour, or if to the rear of the existing development along Athelhampton Road, are of a scale and size that is ancillary to those dwellings.

- The layout and spacing allows for views from within the village to Little Knoll Copse and the ridgeline to the south.

Further to this, Policy 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan sets out that larger dwellings (with 4-bedrooms or more) on sites of two or more dwellings should be limited to no more than a single unit. Policy 4 also sets out further design guidance in particular in relation to conserving heritage assets in the NP area.

The layout of the proposed development would ensure that buildings are kept below the 64m contour and it would also be partly behind existing development along Athlehampton Road. It is considered that the scale and size of these buildings that would be behind Athlehampton Road would be of an appropriate scale and size to those existing dwellings.

The layout of the development would also allow for views to Little Knoll Copse and the ridgeline to the south to be retained as demonstrated in the Design & Access Statement submitted with this application. The landscape would be altered from the existing however the design has been appropriately considered to minimise the impact to the landscape.

The proposed house types and the overall layout of the proposed development would appear similar to the house types found within the locality. The proposed scheme utilises a mix of styles however, overall, it is in-keeping with the rural character of the surrounding area. The proposed layout would result in the main access road leading off Athelhampton Road with connecting inner roads to allow permeability throughout the site.

Parking for the proposed dwellings would be located to the rear of some of the units within rear parking courts and for other dwellings there is a mix of driveway parking and front of house parking with unassigned spaces located along the main access road and the two cul-de-sacs. Whilst rear parking courts in cases can be less favourable in design terms due to the loss of potential private amenity space and some associations in more urban developments that it can create a greater fear of crime, in this instance a relatively small number of dwellings would utilise the rear parking area and it would be well surveilled by the proposed units as the units along the frontage would face windows facing towards this and the proposed flats would also look directly over the parking area. There would also be direct pedestrian access to the footpath that runs around the perimeter of the site adjacent to Milom Lane and on to the proposed footpath along Athelhampton Road.

Therefore, in design terms the rear parking area in this instance is considered appropriate and it ensures an appropriate design can be achieved particularly for the units fronting Athelhampton Road.

Along the proposed frontage the proposed apartments (plots 1-4) have been designed to appear as a pair of semi-detached dwellings where the middle two doors (used to access the first-floor apartments) appear akin to service doors that would lead to allow access to the rear. This ensures front the frontage that the proposed plots appear in-keeping with the surroundings. The proposed plots 1-4 along the frontage would be finished externally with red brick with a pitched slate tiled roof. The proposed window and door quoins would also have some stone detailing and brick arches as well as timber frame porches to plots 1 and 4.

Plots 5-7 would also be located along the frontage with Athelhampton Road which would have a more traditional farmhouse style with some modern elements added over time. Plot 5 would be finished externally with brick and flint and a plain tile or slate roof as well as timber porch. This would appear more akin to a Victorian farmhouse and then adjoining plots 6 and 7 would appear

as modern additions with plot 6 finished with a painted render and plot 7 red brick with side porch entrance.

The remainder of the frontage of the site would consist of public open space and the SuDS ponds. Officers worked with the Applicants to improve landscaping along the frontage with tree and hedge planting. Overall, along the frontage the proposed materials would appear in-keeping with the surrounding area.

Plots 8 and 9 would be situated on the edge of the site adjacent to the boundary with Milom Lane. The plots would be visible to the wider landscape to the west of the site due to their position within the site. The design would take some cues from a converted barn style with open bay parking spaces to the ground-floor. When viewed from the wider landscape to the west, the rooflines and eaves would likely be visible which would give the appearance of converted brick barns.

The dwellings proposed along the main street (plots 10-12 & 16-18) would consist of a mix of detached -and semi-detached dwellings that would be a mix of brick and brick & flint cottage style dwellinghouses. These dwellings would overlook the proposed open space to the front and their private gardens to the rear. Plot 18 would wrap around into a cul-de-sac along the southern edge of the site so when viewed from the main street, the proposed car port would be visible which would appear akin to a traditional barn attached to the rear of the property. The dwellinghouse itself appears as a more historic property that has been altered over time which helps it appear more settled within the wider landscape views to the south.

Plot 19 would also face towards the open fields to the south of the application site, and it has been designed to appear as a converted barn with open car port to the side and garage behind. Floor to ceiling windows in the middle of plot 19 would be the main feature of the dwelling and gives the building prominence within the development however it would appear in-keeping with the rural landscape beyond as it would help to reduce some of its massing when viewed from further away. When viewed with plot 18, the two dwellings would appear similar to how a converted farmstead might appear with a farmhouse and large converted barn. Plot 19 would be finished externally with brick and flint and would have a barn-clip style plain tile or slate roof.

Plots 24-26 would similarly overlook the open fields to the southern boundary, and these would be constructed in a similar style to the dwellings along the main street with the use of red brick and pitched slate or tiled roofs. Plots 27 and 28 would be located behind nos.6 & 7 Athelhampton Road. Plot 27 would be constructed from brick and flint and would have a curved design with brick front porch. The curved design would respond well to the surrounding landscape which curves around the existing houses at Athelhampton Road, and the overall design and materials would integrate effectively with the surrounding area. Plot 28 would have a similar design to the other dwellings proposed on the site consisting of a mix of brick and flint with an attached brick car port.

Plots 20-24 would front onto the proposed open space. The proposed dwelling types would be a similar design to those situated along the main street with a mix of brick and brick and flint dwellings with the general appearance and mix of styles integrating effectively with the surrounding area which consists of a mix of ages and designs of dwellings.

Plots 20-24 would likely be visible from Athelhampton Road although due to their position being set back behind the proposed open space, it would have a much lesser impact on views from Athelhampton Road. Proposed street trees along the main street and in front of plots 20-24 would also soften any views from Athelhampton Road. The proposed building heights have been kept relatively low at two-storeys and one 1.5 storey dwelling at plot 20. This combined with the fact the proposed development would be below the ridgeline and that the curved layout of plots 20-28

which would appear akin with the curved nature of the coppice behind, would ensure that the proposed development would not have a significant visual impact on the surrounding landscape.

The location of the open space towards the front of the site and the addition of footpaths through the site would allow good permeability with the surrounding landscape and views from Athelhampton Road towards Little Knoll Copse remain relatively uninterrupted. The majority of the development would be concentrated on the west side which is situated closer to the existing built form of Puddletown therefore when viewed from Athlehampton Road, views to the landscape beyond the site would be in large retained and the development would appear relatively low in massing. The outlook from Athlehampton Road would be altered from the existing however it is considered that the layout and design of the proposed development would ensure that this harm would be relatively low.

It should also be noted that a degree of landscape harm would have been accepted already due to the allocation set out in the Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst this is for 6 fewer dwellings than the proposal, it is considered that the addition of 6 further dwellings would not result in a significantly greater level of harm compared to the allocation in particular due to the fact that the design would ensure that the openness of the countryside beyond would be retained and views towards Little Knoll Copse would be retained.

The proposed development would result in 5no. 4 dwelling properties which is higher than the amount set out in Policy 11 however it is considered that the overall balance of the site which includes 13no. 1 and 2 bed flats & houses with the remaining 10 being 3 bed houses, would be acceptable for the site given the varied mix in housing and there being a good mix of smaller properties.

On this basis the proposal would be considered acceptable in accordance with Local Plan Policy ENV12 and Policies, 4 11 and 12 of the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan.

14.3 Impact to Designated Heritage Assets:

The proposed plots along Athelhampton Road are the most sensitive areas in terms of potential impact to the nearby listed building, Ilsington House which is Grade II* Listed. There are currently slight views through the trees located along the boundary between Athelhampton Road and Ilsington House which would result in some intervisibility of the proposed development to Ilsington House.

The proposed outlook from Ilsington House would be altered from the current outlook. Currently the fields located opposite Ilsington House where the proposed development would be located have a limited impact on the characterisation of Ilsington House as it appears relatively clear in how the existing trees are situated that there is a clear divide between the rural landscape and Ilsington House. The trees are visible on the first edition OS Map (1888-1913) with the trees marking the boundary between Ilsington House and the landscape beyond. The layout of Ilsington House shown on this OS Map shows clearly the formal gardens set out around Ilsington House and then the informal gardens beyond prior to the tree belt that is located along the boundary with Athelhampton Road. The gardens of Ilsington House would have been carefully laid out to ensure the house had views over its formal gardens with distant rural views beyond. Therefore, the setting of the land that forms the application site would likely have had a lesser role in the setting of the house as opposed to the land on the north side of Athelhampton Road.

In this instance it is considered that the proposed development would likely result in less than substantial harm to the setting of Ilsington House. Historic England and the Council's Conservation Officer both concluded that the development would result in less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset for these reasons. The harm is considered to be no greater than this as the existing rural landscape plays a limited role in the setting of Ilsington House which is noted for its significance in its design and notable history within Puddletown. Historic England state that the resulting harm would be at the lower end of the scale.

The neighbours at Ilsington House commissioned an independent heritage impact report which concluded that the proposal would impact negatively on Ilsington House and that the submission was lacking in detail. However, whilst it is noted there would be some views from the site to/from Ilsington House, it is considered, as set out above, that the harm resulting from this would be no greater than less than substantial at the lower end.

The comments from Historic England raise that careful consideration would need to be given to the materials and the design of the proposed development. The Officers sought some design amendments to the development, particularly for the plots along the frontage, to ensure that the proposal integrated more effectively with its surroundings. Officers consider overall that the design of the proposed development is high-quality and that the proposed materials would be in-keeping with the surroundings. The exact external material details would be secured via a condition attached to this decision if this application is approved.

The Puddletown Conservation Area is situated directly opposite the application site on the other side of Athelhampton Road. The application site is screened to the Conservation Area by an existing tree belt situated alongside Athelhampton Road on the northern side of the carriageway. Therefore, views from the Conservation Area to the application site would be limited. Any views from the west when approaching from Puddletown would also be relatively limited due to other existing development and trees screening views. Therefore, resulting in no harm.

As set out in para 212 of the NPPF, great weight should be afforded to the conservation of heritage assets and the more important the asset, the greater the weight that should be applied. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. In this instance, Ilsington House is Grade II* Listed therefore the conservation of this should be afforded greater weight.

The development would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of Ilsington House. As set out in para 215 of the NPPF, where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Policy ENV4 and Policy 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan also require heritage assets to be conserved and any identified harm to be appropriately weighed against any public benefits of a development. Officers conclude that the identified harm would be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme through delivering 28 homes within a location that has good connectivity to services and the provision of a contribution towards affordable housing.

14.4 Impact to Non-designated Heritage Assets:

The group of buildings, Nos. 1-3 Athelhampton Road, are situated to the north east of the site and are situated directly adjacent to the site boundary. Due to the age of these buildings and their architectural merit, it is considered that these buildings are non-designated heritage assets

(NDHAs). The setting of these buildings is currently characterised by their rural surrounding which would be partly eroded. The buildings are currently characterised by the fact that they have open fields beyond. The development proposes the construction of dwellinghouses behind nos.1-3, the open views that characterise the dwellings in wider settings would be partly lost as a result of the development proposed. - Due to this partial erosion of the setting, it would be considered that the proposal would result in harm to the setting of these NDHAs. The scale of harm would be considered to be moderate on this basis which will be taken into account as part of the planning balance.

14.5 Affordable Housing Viability:

This application underwent a viability assessment in accordance with paragraph 59 of the NPPF (2025) and the guidance set out in the PPG in regard to viability for decision makers.

The following key inputs were taken into account:

Total Build Costs	£5,355,582
External Works Budget	£1,214,060
Abnormal Works incl 5% contingency	£1,418,236
Administration & Development Allowance (includes CIL, affordable housing, legal fees)	£2,068,423
Benchmark Land Value	£800,200
Overhead & Development Profit at 17.5%	£1,720,085
Total Gross Development Costs:	£12,665,151
Total Gross Development Value: (total from the predicted sale)	£11,257,498
Residual Land Value: (Gross Development Value minus Gross Development Costs)	-£1,157,901
Development Residual Value: (Residual Land Value mins Benchmark Land Value)	-£1,958,151

The site is allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan for around 22 dwellings which includes the provision of 35% of these dwellings as affordable housing. The viability assessment carried out by the developer sets out that the changing economic circumstances, particularly in terms of the increase in construction costs, since the site was allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan have resulted in the development not being viable if affordable housing was provided at a policy

compliant level as well as the required CIL contributions and the nutrients mitigation. The summary of this is set out below.

	Plan Stage Review Sep-19	Athelhampton Road Jan-25
Main Works	BCIS Median Rate	BCIS Median Rate
External Works	20%	22.67%
Abnormal & Off Site Works	7.60%	19.38%
Contingency	5%	5%
Professional Fees	10%	8%
Bank Charges	6%	7.75%
Sales & Marketing	3%	2.5%
Profit	20%	17.50%
Planning Gain	£10,127 pu	£20,533 pu

Following an independent review by the District Valuer Service (DVS), the following conclusions were made:

At the assessment date, the DVS surveyor concludes that when assessed with regards to full planning policy requirements (comprising 35% affordable housing, S.106 contributions of £281,662 and CIL contributions of £383,078), the above scheme is not viable.

Through a gradual reduction of policy contributions, the DVS surveyor considers that the maximum amount of financial contribution that can be viably provided is CIL contributions of £498,451, S278 contributions of £50,000, nitrate mitigation contributions of £191,484 and a surplus of £72,165 towards Affordable Housing.

The applicant's appraisals have been produced using recognised software and follows the residual methodology. This is where the viability is derived from the value of the completed development minus the development costs, including profit, construction costs, fees and interest to leave a residual for land. This is compared to the advisor's opinion of an appropriate Benchmark Land Value of £800,200 to determine the viability and deliverability of the scheme. This is in line with the requirements for viability assessments as set out in the PPG.

The below assumptions were made as part of the viability assessment:

- a) The site is held on an unencumbered freehold or long leasehold basis.
- b) The site is readily accessible by public highway and is or can be connected to all mains services.
- c) The site would not occasion any extraordinary costs with regard to Environmental or ground Factors including but not limited to Mining Subsidence, Flood Risk or Asbestos.
- d) That the Council's Local Plan policies, or emerging policies, including for affordable housing are up to date.
- e) That the applicant's abnormal costs, where adequately supported, are to be relied upon to determine the viability of the scheme, unless otherwise stated in our report and/ or otherwise instructed by the Council, and that are no abnormal development costs in addition to those which the applicant has identified

As set out by the DVS, if a scheme includes 35% on site affordable housing, CIL payment of £383,078 and combined S106/Highways/policy contributions of £281,662 and adopts a fixed profit of 15.79% of GDV then the output is the Residual Land Value. This is then compared to the Benchmark Land Value of £800,200 to determine the viability of the scheme. The DVS full policy appraisal generates a residual land value of £387,340 which is below the BLV of £800,200. This appraisal can be found in appendix (i) of the DVS report. Overall, a scheme fully compliant with local plan policies (35% on site affordable housing, £281,662 of contributions) is unviable on this basis.

The second appraisal that the DVS considered removed all affordable housing and £40,178 off site Affordable Housing contributions have also been removed, CIL payment is increased to £498,451, overall profit is increased to 17.50% of GDV. Otherwise, the scheme is based on all the same inputs as above. The modelled financial contribution can be viably provided while still achieving the agreed BLV which is £800,200. It is therefore the opinion of the DVS that the scheme can viably support CIL contributions of £498,451, S278 contributions of £50,000, nitrate mitigation contributions of £191,484 whilst generating a surplus of £72,165 that can contribute towards offsite Affordable Housing.

The Applicants accepted this position that the development could proceed with no on-site affordable housing but with the CIL payment, S278 contribution, nutrients contribution and off-site affordable housing contribution.

The lack of affordable housing on-site would conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan Policy 11 and Policy HOUS1. Policy HOUS1 criterion iii), however, sets out that a lower level of provision will only be permitted if there are good reasons to bring the development forward and the assessment shows that it is not economically viable to make the minimum level of provision being sought. Furthermore, Policy 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that the mix of house types may be varied if there is clear evidence that site specific constraints or viability would otherwise prohibit development. It does on to state that any change to the mix should demonstrate how genuinely affordable homes for the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan area have been maximised as far as possible.

Officers are satisfied that following the review by the DVS that the development would be unviable if a policy compliant level of affordable housing was provided as well as other required contributions and the required CIL charge. On this basis it would be considered that Policy HOUS1 criterion iii) and Policy 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan would be satisfied.

The DVS recommend conditions to allow viability to be reviewed if construction does not start within a prescribed period and also to enable the viability to be reviewed after the abnormal and construction costs have been tendered. In addition, the viability review would only apply to the assessed use and there would be the ability to reassess the viability upon an application for change of use class. This would be secured in the s106 Legal Agreement.

14.6 Amenity for Future Residents:

Each of the proposed dwellings would have a separate private garden which would also provide suitable space for the potential future extension of the proposed dwellings to meet any future occupiers space needs. The proposed apartments at plots 1-4 would have access to a communal garden located to the rear of these plots. The two proposed flats over garages would not have their own separate garden however they would have access to the public open space proposed on the opposite side of the main street and for recreational purposes there are a number of public rights of way, including Hardy's Way, located in close proximity to the site.

All of the proposed main habitable room windows of the proposed dwellings would also have reasonable outlooks and would likely receive sufficient natural daylight. The proposed main bedroom for plot 9 would have an outlook towards the side elevation of plot 8 which would be considered to be a less desirable outlook in particular when compared to the other proposed units however the main living area, dining area and kitchen would all have a reasonable outlook looking over the proposed parking areas and towards the proposed open space. Therefore, on this basis as the main living areas would have a reasonable outlook and all the windows serving main habitable rooms would likely have adequate natural light, it is considered acceptable in this instance. Overall, this would be considered acceptable in accordance with Policy ENV 16 of the West Dorset Local Plan and the NPPF.

14.7 Amenity for Existing Neighbouring Dwellings:

The proposed development would be located adjacent to the existing dwellings 1-7 Athelhampton Road. The proposed plots 20 and 26 would be located around 10m to the garden area of neighbouring nos.2, 3 and 4. The gable end of both of the proposed dwellings would face towards the neighbouring dwellings. The end gable of the garage for plot 26 would also be located a similar distance away from the boundary with neighbouring no.3. It is considered that there likely would be some degree of loss of light to the garden areas of the neighbouring dwellings however the proposed dwellings would be located a reasonable distance away from the boundaries which would ensure that the loss of light would not be significant. In addition, it is considered that this level of separation would help ensure that the proposed dwellings would not be significantly overbearing to the neighbouring dwellings. There would also be no increased in overlooking to the neighbouring dwellings as no windows from the aforementioned plots would be situated on the end gable walls that would face towards the neighbouring dwellings.

Plots 27 and 28 would be located around 4m from the boundary with neighbouring dwellings no.4 and no.6 Athelhampton Road. However, whilst this may result in a greater degree of overshadowing to the gardens of the neighbouring dwellings, it is considered that as the proposed dwellings would affect the very end part of the gardens of the neighbouring dwellings, that this would not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring dwellings. The proposed single-storey car port would be located on the boundary with no.7 however due to its relatively low height it would be considered that this would not have a significant impact on the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling in terms of being overbearing or overshadowing.

The proposed dwellings at plots 27 and 28 would be located around 13m from the boundary with neighbouring nos.6&7 when measured from the proposed first-floor windows on the rear elevation of the proposed dwellings. Therefore, it would be considered that the proposed would not result in a significant increase in overlooking to the neighbouring dwellings.

Overall, this would be considered acceptable in accordance with Policy ENV 16 of the West Dorset Local Plan.

In terms of disruption from construction to any existing nearby residential dwellings, it is considered that a condition could be attached to the decision restricting working hours and a condition requiring a construction traffic plan to be submitted would be attached to the decision, if this application is approved.

14.8 Highways:

The proposed development would result in the creation of a vehicular access leading off Athelhampton Road. The proposed vehicular access was considered acceptable from a Highways safety perspective by the Highways Authority. The proposed layout would also include a tabletop ramp close to the entrance to the site to help control vehicular speeds at this point where traffic would be entering/exiting the site on to Athelhampton Road.

Off-site improvements to Athelhampton Road would also be secured with this application if it is approved. These works would consist of refreshing existing yellow slow markings. The addition of new dragons teeth road markings on the approach to the 30mph zone, the refresh of the 30mph gateway road markings and the existing 30mph gateway feature would be retained and the hedgerows cut back to ensure that the gateway signs are clearly visible. One bus stop island would be created close to the entrance to the site which would involve moving the northern highway edge back and the existing bus stop on the southern side of the highway would be relocated west along Athelhampton Road. An uncontrolled pedestrian crossing would be added across Milom Lane and an uncontrolled crossing would be added across the entrance to the site. A shared footway and cycleway would be created along the southern edge of Athelhampton Road outside of the application site. Officers have recommended that this is secured via condition.

The proposed parking provisions for both cars and cycles is also considered to be satisfactory. The proposed internal road layout and footpath layout was also revised following the initial comments from the Highways Authority to ensure that the proposed layout would be adoptable if the applicants decided to apply for adoption from Dorset Highways.

Officers recommend that conditions are attached to the decision which would secure the access, highway layout, turning and parking areas being constructed prior to occupation, the first 15m of the proposed junction from Lower Road being completed prior to construction work on the site commencing, cycle parking provision being completed prior to occupation, a construction traffic management plan and for the provision of a 2m footway either side of the access road and a crossing point onto Lower Road.

The proposed parking provision and highways improvements would be in accordance with Policy COM9 of the West Dorset Local Plan and Policy 12 and 15 of the NP.

14.9 Surface Water Drainage and Flooding:

Policy ENV5 of the West Dorset Local Plan sets out risk of flooding should be minimised through steering development towards the areas of lowest risk and avoiding inappropriate development in

the higher flood risk zones and ensuring development will not generate flooding through surface water run-off and/or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.

The site of the proposal is shown to fall within Flood Zone 1, as indicated by the Environment Agency's (EA) indicative flood maps and as such is at no modelled fluvial flood risk. The EA's Risk of Flooding from SW (RoFfSW) mapping confirms there is no modelled risk of surface water flooding on site up to the 1-in-1000 year rainfall event.

The site is located within an area identified as being within the groundwater flood area warning however following further on-site testing through the drilling and monitoring of three boreholes between September 2021 and May 2022, it was concluded that the risk of groundwater flooding on the site is low.

The proposed method of surface water drainage would be to discharge to the River Piddle. A surface water sewer would be installed from the site and across third party land to the river. The applicant has received in principle approval for this from Wessex Water. The LLFA confirmed that the proposed method of surface water drainage and the flood risk from the development would be acceptable. The LLFA recommended several conditions which would be attached to the decision if this application is approved.

Overall, Officers consider this is acceptable in accordance with Policy ENV5 of the West Dorset Local Plan and Policy 8 of the NP.

14.10 Foul Drainage:

In terms of foul drainage, foul flows generated by the proposed development would route through a new foul water network towards the existing adopted foul sewer within Athelhampton Road (~90m west of the site). Wessex Water confirmed within pre-application discussions with the applicants that the capacity is adequate to accommodate the proposed development.

Two drainage basins would be situated on-site. The eastern basin would have a depth of 1.6m with the depth being graded by 0.2m every 0.6m. Therefore, the gradient of the basin would be well graded to ensure it would be suitable from a safety perspective. Wooden steps have also been proposed from the top of the basin to the bottom. The basin would be dry apart from in rainfall events exceeding 1in30 (excluding climate change). The second basin would be slightly larger at 3m depth and would be permanently partially filled with water. A pump situated adjacent to the basins would control flows between the basins and to the proposed overflow network.

14.11 Biodiversity and Ecology:

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) came into place in England via revisions to the Environment Act 2021 on 12 February 2024. Any application submitted after this date is subject to BNG aside from those specifically excluded. The minimum percentage requirement (e.g. 10%) should be applied to all area and/or linear unit types found within the development site red line boundary and should be applied irrespective of whether the habitat in question was directly or indirectly impacted by the development. All high distinctiveness habitats require re-creation on a like-for-like basis should

they be lost, whereas there is more flexibility for lower distinctiveness habitat types in terms of what habitat can be delivered if they are lost.

A BNG statement should be submitted with information pertaining to:

- The pre-development biodiversity value
- Steps taken to minimise adverse biodiversity impacts
- The proposed approach to enhancing biodiversity on-site
- Any proposed off-site biodiversity enhancements (including the use of credits) that have been planned or arranged for the development

If planning permission is approved for a development, applicants then must submit a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan to the LPA prior to the commencement of works. This standard condition is not applied to decision notices as part of the list of conditions as this is secured by legislation. There is also no requirement for applicants to submit a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan prior to determination however draft plans can be discussed with the LPA.

The submitted Biodiversity Impact Assessment and BNG Statement confirms that 10% BNG could be achieved with an overall net gain of 11.19%.

The submitted Bat Survey identified an off-site bat roost at Little Knoll Copse which is located over 40m from the site and will be retained however the Survey recommends a series of measures to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on this roost. The survey also assessed an existing tree that is due to be removed which was considered to have low roosting potential however a soft felling approach is recommended in the survey to ensure the protection of any bats. The application site overall was considered to be of moderate local value for foraging and commuting bats.

The submitted Ecological Appraisal sets out that the site is dominated by habitats of limited nature conservation interest and subject to the measures recommended in the appraisal for habitat retention, protection, creation and enhancement, there would be no reduction in ecological interest of the site or its surroundings. Little Knoll Copse is however situated close to the site which is designated as Ancient Woodland. A buffer zone between the proposed dwellings and the edge of the site has been proposed to help ensure the conservation of any habitats supported by the Copse. Future residents would also be provided with information surrounding living close to a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).

In terms of on-site ecological enhancements, the Ecological Appraisal makes the following recommendations:

- Enhancement of hedgerows and connective habitats, including:
 - Enhancement of existing hedgerows through sensitive management, infilling of gaps and establishment of adjacent complimentary habitats including meadow and rough grassland, scrub and tree planting, to enhance connective habitats across the site;
 - Re-instatement of traditional management techniques such as laying, pollarding and coppicing of retained mature hedgerow shrubs and trees (where appropriate) to improve their longevity and enhance structural diversity; and
 - Strengthen linear habitat corridors within and across the site through use of native species-rich hedgerow, scrub and tree planting as boundary features and to delineate

property/ area curtilages. Where possible these should complement on- and off-site areas of connective habitat.

- Creation of new sympathetically designed wetland habitats such as ponds, ditches, swales and wet grasslands, either as standalone features or as part of the site surface water drainage strategy;
- Inclusion of other habitats of high nature conservation interest within areas of open space, including rough and meadow grassland and native species-rich scrub habitats, ideally in locations where they complement existing habitats and/or improve connectivity around the site and the wider area;
- Prioritising the use of native species typical of the local area in landscape planting where appropriate to do so and avoiding invasive species and cultivars. Where possible these should be sourced from stock of local provenance;
- Use of nectar and pollen-rich and fruit and nut-producing species within formal landscaping schemes to benefit species including birds, invertebrates, Dormice, bats and foraging Badgers;
- Provision of bat roosting opportunities and bird boxes on new buildings and existing trees;
- Provision of log and brash piles around hedgerow, scrub and ditch edges to provide habitat for invertebrates, amphibians and reptiles;
- Where appropriate, ensure presence of gaps in boundary fencing to allow movement of wildlife such as Hedgehogs around the site; and
- Sensitive use of lighting to avoid adverse effects on nocturnal wildlife (e.g. restrictions on lighting in public areas to the minimum levels required for safety, use of hooded and bollard lighting, low UV bulbs, presence detectors, timers etc.)

The recommendations set out in the appraisal would be secured via an appropriately worded condition if this application is approved. With the successful implementation of the recommendations, the proposed development would be considered to be in accordance with Policy ENV2 of the West Dorset Local Plan and Policy 6 of the NP.

14.12 Nutrient Neutrality:

The application site is located within the Poole Harbour catchment. Poole Harbour is designated as an SPA and Ramsar site. Within the Poole Harbour catchment, mitigation has been delivered since 2017 through the Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (April 2017). It is not considered appropriate to continue to use the SPD as the approach to calculating nutrient loading and mitigation requirements is no longer consistent with the up-to-date understanding of nutrient pollution.

When Natural England updated their advice for the Poole Harbour catchment in March 2022, phosphorus was added alongside nitrogen as nutrients of concern. After this announcement planning decisions on development proposals where an increase in nutrient loading was likely could only be granted if the proposal included appropriate phosphorus mitigation. On 25 January

2024, the Secretary of State designated Poole Harbour as a nutrient sensitive catchment for both nitrogen and phosphorus.

For all planning applications determined after the 31 July 2024, applicants or developers for qualifying development in Poole Harbour's catchment must secure nutrient mitigation for their development proposal. Mitigation can be secured:

- on-site, or through other land owned by the applicant or developer (as an example mitigation may include changes in land management to offset impacts or a new wastewater treatment works managed by a [NAV](#) water company)
- through an agreement with an accredited third-party mitigation provider
- through an agreement with Dorset and BCP Council acting in their capacity as a nutrient mitigation provider

In all instances, the mitigation will need to be secured in perpetuity through the necessary legal agreements or planning condition and details of the mitigation measures must be presented by the applicant or developer as part of their nutrient neutrality statement.

In this instance, a bespoke nutrient neutrality scheme has been proposed which would involve the removal of an area of agricultural land situated offsite out of agricultural use and planting a natural willow bed. Due to the position of the offsite location within Flood Zone 3, it has been considered by Environmental Assessment and Natural England to be suitable for willow planting as part of a fallow land scheme. A fallow management scheme and nutrient neutrality assessment technical note have been submitted by the Applicants to the LPA. Environmental Assessment have prepared the HRA in respect of these documents and consulted Natural England who raised no objections to the Appropriate Assessment subject to the mitigation being secured via an appropriate mechanism. The details of this and to secure its management in perpetuity would be appropriately secured in a s106 Legal Agreement. This would be in accordance with the requirements of the Habitat Regulations.

14.13 S106 Heads of Terms and CIL:

Heads of Terms:

- The appropriate nutrient neutrality mitigation
- The offsite affordable housing contribution of £72,165
- Viability mechanism to provide a greater contribution to affordable housing if viability improves. The viability scheme would only apply to the assessed use and there would be the ability to reassess the viability upon an application for change of use class
- Option to transfer the Parish Council or management company the Public Open Space

Policy HOUS1 The level of affordable housing required reflects the viability of development land in the local area, and will be:

- 25% in Portland;
- 35% in Weymouth and West Dorset

Policy 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan sets out that where open market housing is proposed affordable housing will be sought, unless the proposal is for replacement or subdivision of an existing home. Policy 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan requires 35% affordable housing (equivalent to 9.8 dwellings).

In this case the application has been through a viability review which was independently reviewed by the DVS. The review by the DVS concluded that based on their Surveyors input on costs and predicted sales data that a contribution to affordable housing offsite and the CIL charge could be provided.

The application site is located within a CIL charge area therefore it would be liable to pay CIL on all new floorspace created by the proposed development.

Education

In terms of education, there are options within the vicinity of the application site with Puddletown CofE First School and St Mary's CofE Middle School being the closest. The proposed development would be providing a contribution towards Primary and Secondary education through being CIL liable which would help to offset the impact of the proposed development on the local schools and would contribute towards either the renovation of the existing school(s) or construction of a new school.

14.14 Conclusions:

The proposed development of 28 dwellings would be located within a location outside of the settlement boundary of Puddletown however an existing allocation for about 18 to 22 dwellings that is set out in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan provides in-principle support for the proposed development. The red line boundary of the proposal exceeds that of the allocation and the number of units is greater than the allocation however it is considered that the 6 additional proposed dwellings would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding landscape or to the nearby heritage assets. The larger site area would also be considered to not have a significantly greater impact either. On this basis, whilst the conflict with the spatial policy is noted, it is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan allocation would outweigh this. The proposed development would have good access via Athelhampton Road into Puddletown. This would allow future occupants to utilise methods of travel other than the private car, such as by walking. There are also bus stops within Puddletown to provide access to the wider area.

The proposed development would result in a degree of visual harm due to the fact it would be altering the existing landscape however the proposed development has been well-designed to ensure that the materials reflect the local vernacular and that the development does not have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding landscape. The proposal has been designed to respond to features in the landscape such as Little Knoll Copse and key views from Athelhampton Road towards the Copse have been retained. The proposed parking layout and dwelling layout also helps to reduce the visual massing of the development so that when viewed from street level, it appears to have a lesser dominance of cars. It should also be noted that a degree of visual harm was already accepted due to the existing allocation for up to 22 dwellings in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan.

Moderate weight should be afforded to the identified harm that would result from the proposed development to the aforementioned non-designated heritage assets, and it should be appropriately weighted within the planning balance.

The proposed development would also conflict with the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan through the fact that it would not be providing any affordable housing onsite due to issues surrounding viability, however Policy 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan does acknowledge that the mix of house types may be varied if there is clear evidence that site specific constraints or viability would otherwise prohibit development, and that any change to the mix should demonstrate how genuinely affordable homes for the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan area have been maximised as far as possible. This conflict should also be provided moderate weight.

The proposed development would provide a meaningful contribution towards to the 5-year Housing Land Supply. Currently there is not a 5-year Housing Land Supply and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies in accordance with paragraph 79 of the NPPF. Therefore, it is considered that significant weight should be afforded to this benefit.

The proposal would also result in some short-term benefits in terms of economic benefits during the construction of the proposed development and it would likely result in some longer-term economic benefits from future residents. These benefits likely would be relatively limited in scale so low weighting should be afforded to these benefits.

The proposal would also result in an off-site contribution towards affordable housing. The proposed development would also result in CIL contributions being provided towards maintain and improving the local infrastructure which would help to offset the impacts of the proposed development on services such as the NHS and local schools.

15. Environmental implications

The construction phase will involve emissions from processes and vehicles/plant at the site. Once occupied any petrol/diesel vehicles of occupiers will produce emissions. However, this must be balanced against the fact that the site is sustainable with public transport access options available and would provide a contribution to affordable housing.

The proposed development would also have to accord with Building Regulations which require developers to consider and analyse the suitability of high-efficiency alternatives, such as heat pumps and renewable sources. Building Regulations also require new build dwellings to accord with certain levels of insulation and efficiency.

16. Summary of issues and the planning balance

Overall, part of the site lies outside of the allocation that is set out in Policy 12 of the NP and as such the number of dwellings proposed is greater than the amount allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. The development would also provide below the policy requirement level of affordable housing which would conflict with Policy 11 of the NP and the development would result in less than substantial harm to a Grade II* designated heritage asset. There would also be conflict with the NP surrounding the fact no allotments or alternative offsite recreation facility have been proposed. However, there are material considerations that outweigh this conflict in terms of the significant contribution towards the Council's 5-year Housing Land Supply of which significant weight should be afforded. The development is also well-located on the edge of Puddletown and in most part within an area allocated for housing in the NP. The proposed development, on balance, is considered to be in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations that would indicate otherwise. On this basis, the proposed development would be considered acceptable and it is recommended that planning permission should be granted.

17. Recommendation

To delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager (Northern Area) to:

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

- Nutrient Neutrality offsite mitigation
- Affordable Housing Contribution
- Viability mechanism to provide a greater contribution to affordable housing if viability improves. The viability scheme would only apply to the assessed use and there would be the ability to reassess the viability upon an application for change of use class
- Option to transfer the Parish Council or management company the Public Open Space

And the following conditions

1. 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).

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

172_DI_11.5 A Location plan

172_DI_19.2 3 Block plan

172_DI_15.14 15 Site Layout Plan

FOG T2-HA-B A Plot 8-9 - Plans and Elevations

QrG5-B-V Quadruple Garage plans and elevations

Bra-B-C Plot 15 - Plans and elevations

Gla-B-C Plot 16 - Plans and elevations

Pul-BF-I A Plot 17 - Plans and elevations

4-2679-Spec2-B-Plot 18 Plot 18 - Plans and elevations

4-2292-Barn-BF A Plot 19 - Plans and elevations

Bry-B-C-Bra-BF-C-Spe Plot 20-22 Plans and elevations

Kno-B-C-lwe-B-I1-V A Plot 23-24 Plans and elevations

TwG2-B-V Twin Garage Plans and elevations

Ibb-B-C-Kin-B-C-V Plot 25-26 Plans and elevations

Reg-B-C-V Plot 27 Plans and elevations

Mor-BF-C-V Plot 28 Plans and elevations

FB-HA-B-Spec A Plot 1-4 Plans and elevations

Kno-BF-C-Gla-B-C-CP-Gla-BS-C Plot 10-12 Plans and elevations

Bry-B-C Plot 13-14 Plans and elevations

SG2-B Single garage plans and elevations

1036-HA-BF-822-HA-R Plot 5-7 Plans and elevations

172_DI_18.3 4 Boundary Materials Plan
 172_DI_21.2 3 Building Heights Plan
 172_DI_22.2 3 Dwelling Mix Plan
 172_DI_20.2 3 Parking Layout Plan
 172_DI_17.4 5 Roof Plan
 172_DI_23.4 5 Scheme Masterplan
 01-PDL-1001 B Preliminary drainage layout
 01-PDL-1002 B Preliminary off-site stormwater outfall
 813.44 / 09G Landscape General Arrangement
 01-PHL-2001 C Preliminary Access Plan
 01-ATR-101 B Vehicular Swept Path Analysis - Refuse
 01-PHL-3003 B Preliminary site levels - highway profiles
 01-PHL-3002 D Preliminary site levels - Sheet 2 of 2
 01-PHL-3001 D Preliminary site levels - Sheet 1 of 2
 01-ATR-102 B Vehicular swept path analysis - fire tender
 01-PHL-2002 B Proposed highway adoption plan

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

3. Before the development hereby approved commences a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The CTMP must include:

- construction vehicle details (number, size, type and frequency of movement)
- a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries
- timings of deliveries so as to avoid, where possible, peak traffic periods
- a framework for managing abnormal loads
- location of construction site access
- contractors' arrangements (compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage)
- wheel cleaning facilities
- vehicle cleaning facilities
- inspection of the highways serving the site (by the developer (or his contractor) and Dorset Highways) prior to work commencing and at regular, agreed intervals during the construction phase
- a scheme of appropriate signing of vehicle route to the site
- a route plan for all contractors and suppliers to be advised on
- temporary traffic management measures where necessary

The development must be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: To minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network and prevent the possible deposit of loose material on the adjoining highway.

4. Prior to the commencement of the development, hereby approved, a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the

development, and providing clarification of how drainage is to be managed during construction and a timetable for implementation of the scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details including the timetable for implementation.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to protect water quality.

5. Prior to the commencement of the development, hereby approved, details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These shall include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To ensure the future maintenance of the surface water drainage system, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

6. Prior to the commencement of the development, hereby approved, a site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan must demonstrate the adoption and use of the best practicable means to reduce the effects of noise, vibration, dust, emissions and site lighting. The plan shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison
2. Arrangements for liaison with the Council's Pollution Control Team
3. All works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary, or at such other place as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be carried out only between the following hours:
 - 08:00 Hours and 18:00 Hours on Mondays to Fridays
 - 08:00 Hours and 13:00 Hours on Saturdays
 - at no time on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays.
4. Deliveries to and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed above.
5. Mitigation measures as defined in BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 shall be used to minimise noise disturbance from construction works.
6. Procedures for emergency deviation of the agreed working hours.
7. Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants. This must also take into account the need to protect any local resident who may have a particular susceptibility to air-borne pollutants.
8. Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes.

Reason: To mitigate, and reduce to a minimum, adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from pollution as described within paragraphs 198-201 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).

7. Prior to the commencement of development above damp-proof course level, details (including colour photographs) of all external facing materials for the walls and roofs of the proposed dwellinghouses shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as have been agreed.

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

8. Prior to the commencement of development above damp-proof course level, details (including colour photographs) of all boundary treatments shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as have been agreed.

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

9. Prior to the commencement of development above damp course level, hereby approved, a soft landscaping and planting scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full during the first planting season November - March following commencement of the development or within a timescale to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include provision for the maintenance and replacement as necessary of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 10 years.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

10. Prior to the commencement of development above damp course level, hereby approved full details of hard landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include where appropriate : proposed finished levels or contours, means of enclosure, car parking layout, other vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation areas, hard surfacing materials, minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, signs, lighting, refuse or other storage units, proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communication cables, pipelines, etc, indicating lines, manholes, supports etc), retained historic landscape features and proposals for their restoration where relevant. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design and maintenance of existing and/or new landscape features.

11. Prior to the installation of the proposed air source heat pumps, details of the noise levels of the proposed air source heat pumps should be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall confirm whether the proposed heat pumps comply with MCS Standards and the exact positions of the proposed air source heat pumps should be provided.

Reason: In order to protect the living conditions of surrounding residential properties.

12. Prior to the first occupation of the development, hereby approved, details of measures to limit the potential consumption of wholesome water use by persons occupying the new dwelling to 120 litres per person per day as measured in accordance with regulation 36 of 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. The submitted details shall include a water consumption calculation for the dwelling in accordance with the Approved Documents referred to above. The approved measures shall be implemented and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To secure nutrient neutrality through effective mitigation in the interests of protected Habitat Sites

13. Before the development is occupied or utilised the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shown on Drawing Number 172_DI_15.16 must be constructed. Thereafter, these must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site.

14. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised the following works must have been constructed to the specification of the Planning Authority:

- Footway widening along the site frontage;
- Enhancement of the Athelhampton Road gateway feature and traffic calming measures;
- Relocation and upgrading of bus stops, including shelters and passenger facilities;
- Provision of pedestrian crossing facilities on Athelhampton Road; and
- Improvements to the Milom Lane junction, including narrowing of the bellmouth and

pedestrian crossing provision.

(broadly in accordance with drawings 01-PHL-2001 B and agreed with the Planning Authority).

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

15. Before the development hereby permitted is occupied, details of the tactile paving at pedestrian crossing points within the internal layout of the estate road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To provide safe and suitable crossing points within the internal layout of the estate road to align with Inclusive Mobility guidance.

16. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised, the submitted Travel Plan must be implemented and operational.

Reason: In order to reduce or mitigate the impacts of the development upon the local highway network and surrounding neighbourhood by reducing reliance on the private car for journeys to and from the site.

17. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the recommendations and requirements in the ecology report titled Ecological Appraisal, by Hankinson Duckett Associates and dated July 2024.

The development hereby approved must not be first brought into use unless and until:

- i) the recommendations detailed in section 8 of the approved ecology report have been completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority (LPA), and
- ii) written evidence demonstrating compliance has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the approved ecology report and thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

18. No works shall commence on site (other than those required by this condition) on the development hereby permitted until the first 15.00m of the proposed access road, including the junction with the existing public highway, has been completed to at least binder course level.

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

Informative Notes:

1. In addition to this permission, the junction works referred to in the condition above must be carried out to the specification and satisfaction of the Highway Authority in consultation with the Planning Authority and it will be necessary to enter into an agreement, under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, with the Highway Authority, before any works commence on the site. The applicant should contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email at highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.
2. The applicant is advised that, notwithstanding this consent, if it is intended that the highway layout be offered for public adoption under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980, the applicant should contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by telephone at 01305 225401, by email at highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.
3. The applicant should be advised that the Advance Payments Code under Sections 219-225 of the Highways Act 1980 may apply in this instance. The Code secures payment

towards the future making-up of a private street prior to the commencement of any building works associated with residential, commercial and industrial development. The intention of the Code is to reduce the liability of potential road charges on any future purchasers which may arise if the private street is not made-up to a suitable standard and adopted as publicly maintained highway. Further information is available from Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.

4. In addition to this permission, the highway improvement(s) referred to in the recommended condition above must be carried out to the specification and satisfaction of the Highway Authority in consultation with the Planning Authority and it will be necessary to enter into an agreement, under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, with the Highway Authority, before any works commence on the site. The applicant should contact Dorset Council's Highways Development team. They can be reached by email at highwaysdevelopment@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Highways Development team, Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.
5. The developer is responsible for coordinating and booking their own road space for utilities and construction works to minimise disruption to the highway network. Guidance is available here: <https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/highway-works-for-new-developments>

OR

B) Refuse permission for the reasons set out below if the agreement is not completed by 30 December 2026 (6 months from the date of committee) or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager (Northern Area).

In the absence of a completed legal agreement by 30 December 2026, or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Head of Planning, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the development would deliver the necessary planning obligations. The proposal therefore fails to secure:

- The appropriate nutrient neutrality mitigation
- The offsite affordable housing contribution
- Viability mechanism to provide a greater contribution to affordable housing if viability improves.
- Option to transfer the Parish Council or management company the Public Open Space

As a result, the development would fail to mitigate its impacts and would place unacceptable pressure on local services and infrastructure.