

Application Number:	P/PIP/2026/03481
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Land North West of Honeybun Meadow The Causeway Hazelbury Bryan
Proposal:	Erection of up to 8no. dwellings (permission in principle)
Applicant name:	Mr John Romans
Case Officer:	Jim Bennett
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Murcer

1. Reason application is going to committee:

The matter was called in for Committee determination by the Chair and Vice Chair under the Scheme of Delegation referral procedure, considering Hazelbury Bryan Parish Council's objection to the departure from the provisions of the Neighbourhood Plan, the officer recommendation being one to grant, subject to conditions.

2. Summary of recommendation:

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

3. Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	Whilst the proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy of the Development Plan, including the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan, and that conflict is afforded significant weight, the proposal would help address identified unmet housing needs, and the site's sustainable relationship with the existing settlement are material considerations of considerable weight. The principle of residential development is therefore considered acceptable.
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	The illustrative plan shows eight modest dwellings could comfortably sit on the site with adequate private amenity space, scope for landscaping and access, without producing a cramped or inappropriate form of development, considered to be in character with the area. Full details to be addressed at the Technical Details stage

Issue	Conclusion
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	A proposal for eight dwellings along the lines of the illustrative plan provided could be designed to provide appropriate levels of amenity, in accordance with Policy 25. Full amenity impacts to be assessed at the Technical Details stage
Flood risk and drainage	The site is not at risk of flooding. Conceptual drainage scheme at the Technical Details stage to address surface water disposal.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	The illustrative layout suggests highway issues raised would not be insurmountable and may be addressed at the Technical Details Stage.
Impact on trees	None
Biodiversity	A scheme could be designed to safeguard any wildlife interest and appropriate mitigation secured. Any Technical Details submission to be accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment to ensure biodiversity enhancements and Biodiversity Net Gain are realised.

4. Description of site

The site adjoins the Hazelbury Bryan Settlement Boundary to the south. Hazelbury Bryan is one of the larger settlements in North Dorset and the site sits close to the village shop and a short distance from the public house and Alec's Field Recreation Ground, some 350m away to the south.

The site is currently an undeveloped paddock, to the south west of Daisy Meadows, a relatively recent residential development of eight dwellings. The site is bound to the south by existing residential development at Honeybun Meadow. To the east is a site known as Rowlands Yard with consent for four dwellings under ref. P/PIP/2026/00690. To the north, the site bounds the village shop and a site with consent for 8 dwellings under ref. P/PIP/2026/00303.

5. Description of development

The application proposes eight dwellings on the site and comprises a location plan identifying the site in red, a block plan and an illustrative plan showing eight detached and semi-detached dwellings and general access and parking arrangements on the site, with a shared point of access from The Causeway.

Due to the type of application (Planning in Principle), the only planning consideration is the principle of development. All other matters such as highways, neighbour amenity, design, flood risk and biodiversity would fall to be considered at the Technical Details stage. While these

matters fall to be considered at a later stage, they are briefly addressed below, to inform the Technical Details stage.

6. Background and relevant planning history

2/2010/1187/PLNG - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 24/01/2011 - Change of use from agricultural building (barn) to village shop. Make alterations to existing access.

2/2018/0107/OUT - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 18/05/2018 - Develop land by the erection of 8 No. dwellings, form vehicular access and car parking. Form public footpath on land south of The Beeches. (Outline application to determine access).

2/2018/1814/REM - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 19/08/2019 - Erect 8 No. dwellings, form vehicular access and car parking. Form public footpath on land south of The Beeches. (Reserved Matters application to determine appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, following the grant of Outline Planning Permission No. 2/2018/0107/OUT).

P/PIP/2026/00690 – Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 16/03/2026 - Erect 4 no. dwellings (permission in principle)

P/PIP/2026/00303 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 10/06/2026 - Erection of up to 8 no. dwellings (permission in principle)

7. List of constraints

NPLA - Neighbourhood Plan Area - Hazelbury Bryan - Distance: 0

LP - North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2031); Adopted; Outside settlement boundaries (countryside); Policy 2, 20; NULL - Distance: 0

DESI - Wessex Water Treatment Works Catchment Other WRC catchments - Distance: 0

PROW - Right of Way: Footpath N41/31; - Distance: 0

WW - Wessex Water Sewage Treatment Works 2023 Odour - Distance: 0

DESI - Higher Potential ecological network - Distance: 0

DESI - High Opportunity Nature Areas - Distance: 0

DESI - Potential Activities - Distance: 0

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Rooksmoor (UK0012681); - Distance: 1469.48

DESI - Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone; - Distance: 0

8. Consultations

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

P - Hazelbury Bryan PC

- The site is not in the Neighbourhood Plan. NDDC & DC's approach so far has broadly been to refuse applications that are not in the Neighbourhood Plan since approving extra development will jeopardise the viability of sites already allocated for development in the Neighbourhood Plan
- The Planning Statement brushes aside our Neighbourhood Plan, barely acknowledging its existence. It also ignores the fact that our NP policies have full planning weight until March 2029. There was a crucial change in the National Planning Policy Framework in December 2024 that gives full weight to NPlan policies for NPlans that are less than 5 years old. Our NPlan is only just over two years old, so policies in the N Plan have full planning weight until March 2029. The applicant quotes DC's housing supply being only 2.53 years. In the past this would have been relevant, but the NPPF change mentioned above gives full weight to NPlan policies notwithstanding the planning authorities overall supply situation.
- The site is outside the Settlement Boundary. Whilst the draft Dorset Plan envisages removing
- Settlement Boundaries, at present it still exists.
- The site design allows for future "add-on" development opportunities further into the field in the future
- This was not a site even considered by DC in its new draft Plan
- This small area of the village has seen very worrying development "creep" over the last few years, and this is yet another example. It started with the Daisy Meadow development opposite the Red Barn shop, which crept in just before our emerging Neighbourhood Plan had any significant planning weight. It was followed by the approval for Rowlands Yard (P/FUL/2022/06869) and then most recently P/PIP/2026/00303 at the Red Barn shop. The latter has just been approved, over-ruling our objection and we have lodged a detailed complaint about this with Dorset Council. If this application is approved it will make a total of 32 new dwellings in this part of the village, whereas our Neighbourhood Plan allocated none here.
- HBPC would also urge you not allow the approval to be yet another precedent that. This would completely undermine the worth and value of the Neighbourhood Plan and the planning weight given to its policies under paragraph 14 of the NPPF. If Neighbourhood Plan policies in a fully up-to-date Plan can be so easily disregarded, the future for existing and new Neighbourhood Plans looks bleak indeed.
- Taking all these into account, the Parish Council OBJECTS to this application

DC - Highways

- The estate road layout needs amendment before it can be considered to be safe for all road users and suitable for adoption under s38 of the Highway Act (if offered), as detailed below.
- In order to assess the application on a highway safety perspective, a drawing will need to be submitted showing the measurements of the access road serving the site 5.5m in width for the first 30m of its length from the main road, to provide safe passing of vehicles and to allow for the provision of the necessary white lining, etc.
- The remainder of the layout should then be provided at a 5.0m width to allow for the two-way flow of vehicles. A 2.0m wide footway should then be provided on both sides of the internal carriageway to facilitate safe movement from all properties and to have due regard for the guidance provided by Inclusive Mobility.
- Pedestrian connectivity will need to be shown with a footway adjacent to The Causeway leading to the shop and towards Honeybun Meadow. The footways will need to be 2m wide.
- At the location for the access, a tactile dropped crossing point will be required to allow. This will allow for inclusive mobility and prams and pedestrians a safer mode of getting to amenities.
- A swept path analysis would need to be submitted showing a refuse vehicle/fire tender, able to enter the site and turn and drive out in a forward gear.
- Once the changes have been made to the estate road design, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit of the highway layout must be submitted in support of the development proposal.

Representations received

Two objections received raising the following points:

- The site on agricultural land and there is no access to the farmland behind. This is the only entrance to the field.
- The overall size of the plot is small for 8 houses. One of the plots has no allocated parking which would mean parking on the road and obstructing access. The maximum number of houses should be no more than four.

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.

10. Relevant policies

Adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2016):

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

Policy 1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy 2: Core Spatial Strategy
Policy 3: Climate Change
Policy 4: The Natural Environment
Policy 5: The Historic Environment
Policy 6: Housing Distribution
Policy 7: Delivering Homes
Policy 20: The Countryside
Policy 23: Parking
Policy 24: Design
Policy 25: Amenity

Made Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan (March 2024):

Policy HB1: Reinforcing Local Landscape Character
Policy HB2: Protecting and Enhancing Local Biodiversity
Policy HB5: Locally Distinctive Development
Policy HB13: Settlement Boundaries and Important Gaps
Policy HB15: Meeting Housing Needs – Amount and Location of New Dwellings
Policy HB16: Meeting Housing Needs – Dwelling Types
Policy HB22: Parking Provision

Other Material Considerations

Emerging draft Dorset Council Local Plan:

Policy DM4: Emerging development plan proposals 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 emerging Dorset Local Plan is being prepared in accordance with plan-making processes set out in the Levelling Up and Regenerating Act 2023 and Local Planning Regulations (2026). As the plan is still at an early stage of the plan making process, limited weight can be attached to it when taking decisions on planning applications. Decisions on planning applications should continue to be assessed against the policies in adopted development plans, national planning policy and any other relevant material considerations.

Housing land supply

Dorset Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply. The position set out in the latest Housing Land Supply Report is 2.53 years on 1st April 2025. In addition, the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the levels of housing needed under the Government's revised standard method. Recent calculations suggest a need of c. 3,246 new homes per year. Under the new NPPF, the consequence is that Policy S5(1)(j) applies. This supports granting permission for development outside of settlements that aims to address unmet need. It states that development needs to be "physically well-related to an existing settlement ... and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing and proposed availability of infrastructure." However, Policy S5 suggests that permission should not be given when:

- "the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the [NPPF]"; or
- "the nature of the development would make this inappropriate"

Housing Delivery Test (HDT)

The latest HDT results (2025 measurement) show that insufficient homes have been delivered within the local plan area (88%) and that a local action plan is required.

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.

National Planning Policy Framework 2026:

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published on 17 August 2026, sets out the Government's national planning policies for both plan-making and decision-making in England.

When determining development proposals decision-makers are required to take a positive and proactive approach and to seek to approve sustainable development where possible.

The NPPF introduces a permanent presumption in favour of sustainable development, through Policies S3 to S5 (which replaces the former "tilted balance" contained in paragraph 11 of the previous NPPF) and sets out the principles for development within and outside settlements. The Framework also confirms that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant NPPF sections include:

- Chapter 3: Decision making policies. Local planning authorities should approach decision making positively, proactively and proportionately. They should work with applicants through pre-application engagement and consultations and aim to resolve concerns through planning conditions or obligations where possible to avoid delay and to enable an approval rather than a refusal. Applications that accord with the development plan, the NPPF and other material considerations should not be refused where they can clearly be approved.
- DM3 Determining development proposals

- Chapter 4: Achieving Sustainable Development. The objective of the policies in this chapter is to meet development needs through sustainable patterns of development, including by maximising the potential for growth on suitable land within settlements, enabling development which will support the rural economy, rural communities and the provision of infrastructure, and limiting development away from settlements to help safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
 - S3 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - S5 Principle of development outside settlements
 - S6 Neighbourhood plans and the presumption
- Chapter 6: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes. Planning decisions should give substantial weight to providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community.
 - HO7 Meeting the need for homes
- Chapter 12: Making effective use of land. Planning decisions should give substantial weight to proposals that make more effective use of land and buildings, while maintaining good design, living conditions and local character. This includes redevelopment of previously developed, vacant, underused, contaminated or derelict sites, reuse of existing buildings, creation of additional homes through sensitive infill, upward extensions and development within existing plots. Higher-density development is also promoted within settlements in well-connected locations near public transport. Development that fails to make efficient use of land in accordance with the policy should be refused.
 - L2 Making effective use of land
 - L3 Achieving appropriate densities
- Chapter 14: Achieving well-designed places. Development should be high quality, respect and enhance local character, deliver sustainable and attractive places, and accord with relevant design policies. Proposals that demonstrate good design and place-making should be supported, while those that fail to meet established design standards should be refused unless clearly justified.
 - DP3 Key principles for well-designed places
 - DP4 The design process
- Chapter 15: Promoting sustainable transport. The objective of the policies in this chapter is to ensure that transport considerations are taken fully into account in the preparation of development plans and the evolution and assessment of development proposals; using a vision-led approach to embed the role that transport infrastructure and choices can play in creating well-designed, sustainable, inclusive and popular places.
 - TR3 Locating development in sustainable locations

- Chapter 19: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment: Development should conserve and enhance the natural environment by protecting important landscapes, habitats, biodiversity and trees, while maximising opportunities for nature recovery, green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain. Proposals should avoid significant environmental harm, prioritise land of lower environmental value where possible, and be sensitively designed in protected landscapes and coastal areas. Development causing unacceptable impacts on designated sites, irreplaceable habitats or biodiversity that cannot be adequately avoided, mitigated or compensated for should be refused.
 - Improving the natural environment biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.
- N2 Improving the natural environment

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. The position set out in the latest Housing Land Supply Report is 2.53 years on 1st April 2025. In addition, the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the levels of housing needed under the Government's revised standard method. Recent calculations suggest a need of c. 3,246 new homes per year. Under the new NPPF, the consequence is that Policy S5(1)(j) applies. This supports granting permission for development outside of settlements that aims to address unmet need. It states that development needs to be "physically well-related to an existing settlement ... and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing and proposed availability of infrastructure." However, Policy S5 suggests that permission should not be given when:

- "the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the [NPPF]"; or
- "the nature of the development would make this inappropriate"

Housing Delivery Test (HDT)

The latest HDT results (2025 measurement) show that insufficient homes have been delivered within the local plan area (88%) and that a local action plan is required.

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 proposal seeks Permission in Principle for residential development on land immediately adjacent to the existing settlement of Hazelbury Bryan. The site is within reasonable walking distance of local services and facilities, including the village shop and other community facilities, and is well-related to existing residential development. As such, the site is considered to represent a sustainable location with the potential to provide future residents, including those with protected characteristics, access to housing and local services.

At this stage, only the principle of residential development, land use and amount of development are under consideration. Detailed matters relating to accessibility, layout, movement, parking arrangements, pedestrian connectivity and the design of any dwellings would be considered as part of any subsequent Technical Details Consent application.

The Council is satisfied that no adverse impacts on persons with protected characteristics have been identified at the Permission in Principle stage. Furthermore, the Public Sector Equality Duty is a continuing duty and will remain a material consideration at the Technical Details Stage, where detailed design and accessibility matters can be fully assessed.

13. Public Benefits

The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These include a small contribution to the current under-supply of housing land by the provision of up to 8 market units and jobs from construction.

14. Planning Assessment

Principle of development

Policies 1 and 2 of the adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (NDLP), outline the Council's strategy for achieving sustainable development within the former North Dorset area.

Conflict with the North Dorset Local Plan

Policy 2 (the Core Spatial Strategy of the NDLP) identifies the four main towns in the district (Blandford, Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Sturminster Newton) as the primary focus of growth, with Stalbridge and a list of 18 larger villages, including Hazelbury Bryan, accommodating further development to meet local needs. Development outside defined settlement boundaries is treated as countryside, where development is strictly controlled.

In this instance, the site is located beyond the defined settlement boundary of Hazelbury Bryan, meaning for policy purposes it is located in the countryside. Policy 20 of the NDLP states that development in the countryside will only be permitted where it is of a type appropriate to a countryside location, or where an overriding need for the development to be located in the countryside can be demonstrated.

The proposal comprises up to 8 market dwellings on an unallocated greenfield site outside the settlement boundary and does not fall within any of the categories of development envisaged by Policy 20. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with Policies 2 and 20 of the NDLP and, more generally, with the spatial strategy of the development plan. Significant weight is attached to this conflict.

Conflict with the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan

In addition to the above assessment against the Local Plan, the site is also located within the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan (HBNP) area. The HBNP was made in March 2024, forms part of the statutory development plan and is therefore afforded full weight.

Policy HB15 of the HBNP allocates land for 55 dwellings within the village for the plan period (2018-2033) and states that 'the release of unallocated greenfield sites outside the settlement boundary should be limited to rural exception affordable housing sites, and sites for open market housing should therefore be resisted'.

The application proposes up to 8 open market dwellings on an unallocated greenfield site beyond the settlement boundary. The proposal therefore directly conflicts with Policy HB15 and the wider spatial strategy of the HBNP. Significant weight is attached to this conflict.

Notwithstanding the identified conflict with the HBNP and Policies 2 and 20 of the NDLP, the decision must also have regard to the Policy 1 of the NDLP and the relevant provisions of the NPPF.

Policy 1 of the NDLP and the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 1 of the NDLP establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development and reflects the approach set out in national policy. The policy confirms that development proposals which accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. It further provides that where the policies most important for determining an application are out of date, permission should be granted unless material considerations indicate otherwise, provided the development would represent sustainable development.

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The latest Housing Land Supply position identifies a supply of 2.53 years. As a consequence, the policies most important for determining the application, including those which restrict the supply of housing through the settlement boundary and countryside strategy, attract reduced weight in the decision-making process.

Nevertheless, those policies remain part of the development plan and the conflict identified with Policies 2 and 20 of the NDLP, and Policy HB15 of the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan, continues to attract great weight. The extent to which those conflicts are outweighed by other material considerations is considered below having regard to Policies S5 and S6 of the NPPF.

National Planning Policy Framework

Policy S3 of the NPPF establishes a permanent presumption in favour of Sustainable Development. For proposals outside of settlements, this includes consideration of Policy S5.

Policy S5 lists the forms of development that are appropriate outside of settlement boundaries and indicates that planning permission should be granted for such forms of development unless the benefits of the proposal are substantially outweighed by the adverse effects when assessed against the national decision making-policies of the NPPF.

Policy S5(1)(j) provides support for development that would address an evidenced unmet need, including housing proposals where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites or is delivering less than 75% of its housing requirement through the Housing Delivery Test. The policy requires that such development is physically well-related to an existing settlement and is of a scale capable of being accommodated having regard to infrastructure provision.

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the latest published Housing Land Supply position identifying a supply of 2.53 years. Furthermore, the most recent Housing Delivery Test results indicate housing delivery of 88%, demonstrating continuing under-delivery of housing within the local plan area.

In this case, the proposal would contribute towards addressing an identified unmet housing need at a time of significant housing land supply shortfall. The site is immediately adjacent to the built-up area of Hazelbury Bryan and is well-related to existing and approved residential development. It is also located within reasonable walking distance of services and facilities within the village. With a maximum of 8 dwellings proposed, the scale of development is modest and there is no evidence before the Council to suggest that the proposal could not be accommodated having regard to infrastructure capacity.

Policy S6 of the NPPF recognises the importance of neighbourhood planning and indicates that, for housing proposals, the adverse effects of granting permission are likely to substantially outweigh the benefits where a proposal conflicts with a neighbourhood plan that became part of the development within the previous five years and contains allocations to meet its identified housing requirement.

The HBNP was made in March 2024 and contains allocations intended to meet the housing requirement identified at the time of its preparation. Accordingly, the circumstances described within Policy S6 are engaged and substantial weight is attached to the identified conflict with the HBNP.

Other Material Considerations

Whilst substantial weight is attached to the conflict with the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with Policy S6 of the NPPF, there are other material considerations which weigh in favour of the proposal.

Since the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan was prepared and made, there have been significant changes to national policy and the methodology used to calculate housing requirements. In particular, the revision to the Standard Method published in December 2024 resulted in a substantial increase in Dorset's assessed housing requirement of approximately 80%. Whilst this does not diminish the development plan status of the HBNP, nor the weight afforded to it through Policy S6 of the NPPF, it is a material consideration which demonstrates that the housing need now identified across Dorset is materially greater than that which informed the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the latest Housing Land Supply position identifying a supply of 2.53 years. Furthermore, the most recent Housing Delivery Test results indicate that only 88% of the required homes have been delivered within the local plan area, resulting in a requirement for a Housing Delivery Action Plan. These circumstances demonstrate a significant and continuing shortfall in housing delivery.

The proposal would contribute towards addressing this housing shortfall through the delivery of up to 8 dwellings. Whilst modest in scale, the proposal would assist in increasing housing supply at a time when the Council faces a substantial deficit in deliverable housing land. Significant weight is therefore attached to the contribution the proposal would make towards meeting identified housing needs.

In addition, whilst the site lies beyond the defined settlement boundary of Hazelbury Bryan, it is immediately adjacent to the existing built form of the village and is well-related to existing and permitted residential development. The site is within walking distance of local services and facilities, including the village shop, and would not result in isolated or unsustainably located development within the countryside. The scale of development proposed is modest and there is no evidence before the Council to suggest that the proposal could not be accommodated having regard to existing or proposed infrastructure provision. These factors attract moderate weight in favour of the proposal.

Planning Balance

The proposal conflicts with Policies 2 and 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan and Policy HB15 of the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan. Significant weight is attached to these conflicts. Furthermore, Policy S6 of the NPPF supports the attachment of substantial weight to the conflict with the recently adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

However, significant weight must also be afforded to the Council's inability to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the continuing under-delivery of housing within the local plan area and the contribution the proposal would make towards addressing identified

housing needs. Further weight is afforded to the site's sustainable relationship with the existing settlement and the modest scale of development proposed.

Having regard to the above, it is concluded that the material considerations in favour of the proposal are sufficient to outweigh the identified conflict with the Development Plan in this instance. The principle of residential development is therefore considered acceptable

Accordingly, the Permission in Principle can be recommended for approval. The overall acceptability of any scheme would require all other matters to be addressed at Technical Details Consent Stage. At this stage however, there is no reason to believe that an appropriate scheme to address other matters could not come forward.

Impact on character and appearance of the area

There are existing housing developments and extant consents adjacent to and opposite the application site (see Map 1). In view of this, development of the site for housing purposes would not be at odds with the overall character of development in this part of the village. The scheme would not result in significant encroachment into the open countryside, more an infill scheme between existing and proposed housing developments. The illustrative plans suggest overdevelopment will be avoided. Eight modest dwellings could comfortably sit on the site with adequate private amenity space, scope for landscaping and access, without producing a cramped or inappropriate form of development, considered to be in character with the area. It is not abundantly clear from the illustrative submission whether adequate access, parking and turning provision can be achieved, but this could be addressed at the Technical Details stage.

While the site lies within the countryside, there is no reason to believe that an appropriately designed scheme could not come forward, with matters of access/turning, scale, design, landscaping and appearance assessed at the Technical Stage. The illustrative layout shows how a development of 8 dwellings could be accommodated, in character with the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with Local Plan Policy 24 and Policy S5e of the NPPF.

Amenity Impacts

In respect of impacts upon the amenities of neighbouring properties in terms of overbearing impact, loss of outlook, unreasonable loss of light, noise, disturbance, other pollution and amenity of future occupiers, it is apparent that a proposal for eight dwellings along the lines of the illustrative plan provided could be designed to provide appropriate levels of amenity, in accordance with Policy 25. Full amenity impacts to be assessed at the Technical Details stage

Flood Risk

The site is not considered at increased risk of flooding based upon the National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA2), or the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Whilst the increase in impermeable surfacing could result in increased surface water, submission of a conceptual drainage scheme at the Technical Details stage could address this matter.

Access and Highway Safety

The proposal will utilise an existing field gate access for vehicular access to the site. The Highway Authority note that the illustrative estate road layout needs amendment before it can be considered to be safe for all road users and suitable for adoption under s38 of the Highway Act. With this in mind, they indicate that drawings are necessary to make provision for safe passing of vehicles, to allow for the provision of white lining and 2m wide footways on both sides of the internal carriageway to facilitate safe movement. Pedestrian connectivity will need to be shown with a 2m footway adjacent to The Causeway leading to the shop and towards Honeybun Meadow, tactile dropped crossing point provided at the access and swept path analysis provided showing a refuse vehicle/fire tender, able to access and egress the site. Once the changes have been made to the estate road design, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit of the highway layout must be submitted in support of the development proposal. As a permission in principle application, the LPA cannot request submission of details to address these points at this stage. They would more appropriately be addressed by any Technical Details submission and an informative is applied to this effect.

The illustrative layout suggests the requests made by Highways, would not be insurmountable at the Technical Details Stage. The Technical Details should also clarify the off-street parking arrangements for all plots, as the illustrative plan suggests one plot is devoid of any, which needs to be clarified.

Biodiversity

The Council has a legal duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Policy 4 of the Local Plan advises that developments that offer gains in biodiversity whether through the restoration of habitats or the creation of linkages between existing sites, will be looked upon favourably in the decision-making process. A scheme could be designed to safeguard any wildlife interest and appropriate mitigation secured. Any Technical Details submission should be accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment agreed with Dorset Council's Natural Environment Team to ensure biodiversity enhancements and Biodiversity Net Gain are realised.

At this stage, it cannot be determined if the proposal will be exempt from biodiversity net gain.

Other Matters

The Parish Council notes that the site design allows for future "add-on" development opportunities further into the field in the future. The site plan is illustrative and does show the potential for access to the field to the west, albeit occupied by a bin area. This cannot substantiate a reason for refusal, but the case officer's view is that this area should be shown as planted in the landscaping arrangements submitted with any subsequent Technical Details proposal.

With regard to the comments of notified parties on access to the field system to the west, this is primarily a matter for the applicant to address, but it would be useful to understand how this might work under any Technical Details submitted.

The site directly adjoins Footpath N41/31 to the south east and the proposal does not impinge upon its line. However, any Technical Details submission will be expected to enhance its setting, through sensitive form of development and landscaping.

Conclusions

The proposed development conflicts with the Development Plan when read as a whole, including Policies 2 and 20 of the North Dorset Local Plan and Policy HB15 of the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan. Significant weight is attached to this conflict. However, the Council's inability to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the continuing under-delivery of housing within the local plan area and the contribution the proposal would make towards addressing identified housing needs are material considerations that attract significant weight in favour of the development.

Further weight is afforded to the site's sustainable relationship with Hazelbury Bryan, its proximity to local services and facilities, and the modest scale of development proposed. Officers are satisfied that the site represents an accessible and sustainable location for residential development and that there is no evidence before the Council to suggest that the development could not be accommodated without unacceptable environmental impacts. Matters relating to design, layout, highways, ecology, drainage and accessibility would be considered in detail at the Technical Details Consent stage.

Having regard to the above, it is concluded that the material considerations in favour of the proposal are sufficient to outweigh the identified conflict with the Development Plan in this instance. The principle of residential development is therefore considered acceptable and the application is recommended for approval, subject to the subsequent consideration of Technical Details Consent.

15. Recommendation

GRANT subject to the following conditions:

1. Technical details consent shall be applied for and approved within the three-year time limit of this permission in principle consent.

Reason: As directed by the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017.

2. The minimum number of residential dwellings permitted by this permission in principle is 8 and maximum number of residential dwellings permitted by this permission in principle is 8.

Reason: As required by the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017.

Informative Notes:

1. For the avoidance of doubt, the following plans that have been considered in granting this permission, but are considered illustrative at this stage:

Location and Block Plan: 20076-3

Existing Site Survey: 20076-1

Proposed Site Survey: 20076-2

2. The applicant is advised to review the Officer Report and case file associated with this consent P/PIP/2026/03481 and to address the salient issues raised by consultees. These should be submitted as part of any subsequent Technical Details Planning Submission. Detailed plans and statements will be required to demonstrate the development will be acceptable in respect of Highways, Biodiversity (BNG), Visual Appearance, Amenity, et al.

3. Dorset Council Building Control Informatives

1. The garages and houses must comply with the requirements of B4 of the Building Regulations (with regard to not having combustible materials near to, or on a site or notional boundary)

2. Fire and Rescue Service access to accord to the requirements of B5 of the Building Regulations

4. Informative: National Planning Policy Framework

In accordance with policy DM3 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

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

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

In this case the application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

5. Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are listed below.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission would be Dorset Council.

On the basis of the information provided to determine the application, it is not possible to indicate whether it is considered that this planning permission is one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun. This is because it cannot be determined whether the permission would benefit from a self-build exemption, or the de minimis exemption.

Before commencing development, you should consider whether a Biodiversity Gain Plan needs to be submitted and approved. Commencing development which is subject to the biodiversity gain condition without an approved Biodiversity Gain Plan could result in enforcement action for breach of planning control.

Read more about Biodiversity Net Gain at <https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/biodiversity-net-gain>.