

APPLICATION PROPOSAL	Demolish the existing buildings and erect a dementia care home with new vehicular access and parking provision (revised scheme from previously refused applications) (amended plans submitted 28.02.2020)		
ADDRESS	5 - 7A Edmondsham Road Verwood BH31 7PA		
RECOMMENDATION	Grant, subject to conditions (see Section 9 of the report for the full recommendation)		
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE	The nominated officer has requested that the application be determined by committee due to impact on the area and neighbouring amenity		
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed is located within the urban area of Verwood • Within 400m of protected heathland, the principle of a dementia care home is generally acceptable • Previous reasons for refusal have now been overcome and it is considered there are no longer any matters which would warrant a refusal of planning permission in this case. 		
INFORMATION ABOUT FINANCIAL BENEFITS OF PROPOSAL			
<u>The following are considered to be material to the application:</u>			
Contributions to be secured through Section 106 legal agreement: N/A			
Contributions to be secured through CIL: £74605 (approx.)			
Net increase in numbers of jobs: 20			
Estimated increase/ reduction in average annual workplace salary spend in District through net increase/decrease in numbers of jobs: N/A			
APPLICANT	Fayrewood Property Ltd	AGENT	Mr Darryl Howells
WARD	Verwood	PARISH/ TOWN COUNCIL	Verwood
PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE	19 March 2020	OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE	November 2019
DECISION DUE DATE	13 February 2020	EXT. OF TIME	8 th July 2020

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY			
App No	Proposal	Decision	Date

3/19/0341/OUT	Demolish the existing buildings and erect a part 3/part 4 storey 38 bedroom dementia care home with new vehicular access and parking provision	Sept	2019
<p>Reasons for refusal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The positioning of the proposed care home's northern elevation in relation to windows serving habitable rooms in the adjacent dwelling 9 Edmondsham Road would cause an unacceptable loss of light, outlook and amenity to this neighbouring property. In addition, the scale and position of the main outdoor amenity space for the proposed care home which as designed is likely to be intensively used would create a relationship likely to cause unacceptable levels of disturbance to the occupants of adjacent existing dwellings and result in overlooking of the outdoor amenity space by existing windows at 9 Edmondsham Road. The proposal is contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1 (2011) and Saved Policy DES2 of the East Dorset Local Plan (2001). - The proposed parking spaces located between the eastern elevation of the proposed care home and Edmondsham Road would prevent the establishment of a suitable landscaping and boundary strategy and fail to provide space for a suitable relationship between the building and the road. The parking and multiple access points represents a contrived and cluttered design which would fail to adequately respect or enhance Edmondsham Road and which does not leave adequate scope for the accommodation of a landscaping scheme and would have a detrimental impact on the street scene. This is contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1 (2011) and Saved Policy DES11 of the East Dorset Local Plan (2002). - The trees along the southern and south western boundaries of the site fronting Edmondsham Road are a significant landscape component of this part of Verwood, creating a sense of rural enclosure to the road and acting as a screen to the site. The trees are shown to be retained. However the retention of the trees, their requirements for space and an undisturbed area retained around them has not been adequately identified in the submitted arboricultural information. The arboricultural impact assessment does not reflect the on-site conditions. The amended arboricultural submission relies of using the minimum root protection area based on BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, which is not appropriate given the importance of the trees, the magnitude of development and their resilience to change. <p>Consequently the location of the building and as importantly the associated hard surfacing is not acceptable because its proximity to the important line of trees and will result in direct and indirect damage to the root systems which will have a negative impact on the health of the trees and the amenity that they offer. The proposal is contrary to Policies HE2 and HE3 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1 (2011) in relation to its impact on these important trees and their contribution to the appearance of the local landscape.</p>			

- The submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy dated 12/06/2019 fails to demonstrate that flood risk will not increase as a result of the proposed development, or that options have been taken to reduce overall flood risk, contrary to Policy ME6 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1 (2011).
- The submitted Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan is not certified by the Dorset Natural Environment Team, and therefore fails to meet the requirements of the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol. The submission fails to provide certainty that impacts on biodiversity will be adequately mitigated, or that enhancement will be effective, contrary to Policy ME1 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1 (2001).

App No	Proposal	Decision	Date
3/19/2163/OUT	Demolish the existing buildings and erect a part 3/part 4 storey 38 bedroom dementia care home with new vehicular access and parking provision (Outline application with landscaping a reserved matter)	Feb	2020

Reasons for refusal:

- The positioning of the proposed care home's northern elevation in relation to windows serving habitable rooms in the adjacent dwelling 9 Edmondsham Road would cause an unacceptable loss of light, outlook and amenity for the occupants of this neighbouring property contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1 (2014) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The proposal fails to adequately address the long term health and retention of protected trees to secure their continued contribution as a significant landscape component of this part of Verwood, contributing to the character of the area in which they create a rural enclosure to the road and act as a screen to the site. The BS5837:2012 Trees has been followed to a point but without any notion that the retained trees root spread will inevitably be more concentrated within the site due to the proximity of structures off site. This is considered unacceptable given the importance of the trees, the magnitude of development and the negative impact that the development will have on the existing trees. The proposal has not adequately demonstrated that it is compatible with protected trees, contrary to Policies HE2 and HE3 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1 (2014).
- Due to the nature of basement rooms which have a north west orientation, reduced external amenity space servicing rooms and lack of functioning fenestration for room B5, light will be restricted to an unacceptable level in rooms B1-B5. Therefore these proposed bedrooms would provide living conditions

which are wholly inadequate, particularly for dementia care patients whose principal living space would be these rooms. The proposed living accommodation of these rooms would have detrimental impact on the amenity of future occupiers and is therefore contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1 (2014) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- The submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy dated 12/11/2019 provides insufficient information in relation drainage calculations and details of drainage options to demonstrate that flood risk will not increase as a result of the proposed development and that a sustainable drainage strategy can be secured, contrary to Policy ME6 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan: Part 1 (2014) and paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

MAIN REPORT

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1.01 The site is situated within the urban area of Verwood, adjoining the town centre boundary to the south of the site. The wider surrounding development comprises a mixture of residential and commercial uses.
- 1.02 The existing site comprises three detached single storey structures including one bungalow in residential use on plot, totalling approx. 0.2ha, accessed via driveways from Edmondsham Road. The existing buildings are clustered to the north-east of the site, with areas of garden to the south and west. The site is covered by a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO), with the main group of trees located to the south of the site.
- 1.03 To the north of the site are a pair of semi-detached properties 9 & 11 Edmondsham Road, these properties pre-date much of the development on Edmondsham Road and no. 9 in particular is oriented with a number of rooms within the property facing south on the side elevation. To the west of the site is a group of three bungalows, 8-12 Station Road, these are set behind development fronting on to Station Road, with a turning and parking area adjoining the site. To the south-west of the site are garden areas for nos. 2 & 4 Station Road, and to the south The Old Crossroads comprises a mixture of commercial units with some flats above. A three storey block of flats is located opposite the site at Fayrewood Court.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 This is an outline planning application with landscape matters reserved to:

‘demolish the existing buildings and erect a dementia care home with new vehicular access and parking provision (outline application with landscaping matters reserved) (revised scheme from previously refused applications)’

- 2.02 Two applications for the same proposal were originally submitted, to the Council for determination. The correlating application PA 3/19/2163/OUT was refused in February 2020 (reasons set out in full above). This application was subsequently amended to address the reasons for refusal set out in relation to application 3/19/0163/OUT. This application is assessed on revised drawings submitted in February 2020.
- 2.03 The proposal is for a 2-3 storey, plus basement, care home. The building would take the general shape of a ‘T’, with three storey elements to the south and west of the site, stepping down to a two and single storey elements to the north adjacent to 9 Edmondsham Road. The building would also include a curved single story café to the western elevation. The building would include a basement level, where ancillary staff and operational spaces (meeting rooms, kitchen, library, storage, office) would be provided.
- 2.04 The main entrance and service entrance for the site would both be located to the south of the building. The main vehicular access would be taken off Edmondsham Road towards the south of the site, providing access to a car park. The parking within the car park would include nine bays located within a stacking system, for use by staff only, a further 10 spaces (7 within the car park and 3 spaces off Edmondsham Road), cycle parking, ambulance bay and bin store are provided.

3.0 SUMMARY OF INFORMATION

3.01 Changes from the previous application include:

- The proposed basement amenity space has been removed
- Bedrooms in the basement have been removed and number of bedrooms reduced from 38 to 29
- Hard landscaping reduced
- Parking reconfigured as per the amended hardlandscaping
- 2 storey element to the north further set back away from the neighbouring property
- Flood and drainage information revised
- A signed Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP) updated

	Previously Refused 3/19/2163/OUT	Proposed
Site Area (ha)	0.2 ha	0.2 ha
Use	C2 Care Home	C2 Care Home

Floor Area	Basement – 590 m2 Ground floor – 720m2 First floor – 540m2 Second floor – 350m 2 TOTAL – 2200 m2	Basement – 540 m2 Ground floor – 660 m2 First floor – 460m2 Second floor – 350m 2 TOTAL – 2010 m2
Bedrooms	37	29
Approximate Ridge Height (m)	6.1 – 9.5m	4.5 -9.5m
Approximate Eaves Height (m)	4-6.8m	2.6-6.8m
Materials	Brick, render, tile	Brick, render, tile
Parking Spaces	23	21
No. of Storeys	2-3 Storeys	2-3 Storeys
Distance from boundary to no 9	Ground floor – 0-11m First floor – 2.8-15 Second floor - 15 -17.5m	Ground floor – 1.6-11m First floor – 8.7-15m Second floor – 15 -17.5m

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

Medium Pressure Pipeline
Ancient Woodland
Agricultural Land Classification
SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Highways Inspected Network
Heathland 400m Consultation Area
Rights of Way
Airport Safeguarding
Town Centre Boundary
Main Urban Area
Primary Shopping Area
Tree Preservation Order

5.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5.01 Development Plan:

Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (Part 1) 2014 (CS)

The following policies are of particular relevance in this case:

- KS1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- KS2 Settlement Hierarchy
- KS11 Transport and Development
- KS12 Parking Provision
- HE2 Design of new development
- HE3 Landscape Quality
- LN6 Housing Accommodation Proposals for Vulnerable People
- ME1 Safeguarding biodiversity and geodiversity
- ME2 Protection of the Dorset Heathlands
- ME3 Sustainable development standards for new development
- ME4 Renewable energy provision for residential and non-residential developments
- ME6 Flood Management, Mitigation and Defence
- ME1 Safeguarding biodiversity and geodiversity
- DES11 Criteria for ensuring developments respect or enhance their surroundings.

5.02 Supplementary Planning Guidance

Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD

5.03 Government Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

6.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

6.01 In addition to letters to neighbouring properties, a site notice was posted outside the site on the 28 November 2019 with an expiry date for consultation of the 22 December 2019. Neighbours were also reconsulted by letter for the revised design on 5 March 2020.

6.02 In total 66 letters of objection from 44 addresses were received raising the following issues:

	INITIAL DESIGN	REVISED DESIGN
Proposed Use	<p>Another dementia care home is not considered to be required in Verwood</p> <p>Considered to be an inappropriate use in a quiet residential area</p>	<p>Considered to be an inappropriate use in a quiet residential area</p> <p>Is the proposed viable and what will happen if it is not?</p>

<p>Design</p>	<p>Proposed accommodation is not suitable for dementia care patients</p> <p>Revised design is not very different to the previously refused application</p>	<p>Revised design is not very different to the previous design</p> <p>Insufficient number of rooms provided to be viable</p> <p>Insufficient outdoor space is provided for residents</p> <p>Proposed design is not suitable for dementia care patients</p>
<p>Impact on character of the area</p>	<p>3 storeys is considered out of keeping with the character of the area and would be over bearing</p> <p>Overdevelopment of the site</p> <p>Proposed architectural style is out of keeping with the area</p>	<p>Considered out of keeping with the character of the area and would be over bearing</p> <p>Overdevelopment of the site</p> <p>Proposed architectural style is out of keeping with the area</p> <p>Concerns regarding light pollution at night</p>
<p>Neighbouring amenity</p>	<p>Concerns regarding:</p> <p>Overlooking of neighbouring amenity</p> <p>The proposed would result in loss of light for neighbouring properties</p> <p>Additional noise as a result of the proposed will impact neighbouring amenity</p> <p>Noise and smells from the proposed café will impact neighbouring amenity</p> <p>Location of bin store and proximity to neighbours will impact on neighbouring amenity</p>	<p>Concerns regarding:</p> <p>Overlooking of neighbouring amenity</p> <p>The proposed would result in loss of light for neighbouring properties</p> <p>Additional noise as a result of the proposed will impact neighbouring amenity</p> <p>Location of bin store and proximity to neighbours will impact on neighbouring amenity</p>

<p>Access, Traffic and Parking</p>	<p>Concerns regarding:</p> <p>Impact of additional traffic and parking as a result of the proposed where congestion is already caused by existing schools and other local facilities</p> <p>Current public transport is not sufficient to support the proposed development</p> <p>The proposed access road is not suitable with no pavements or streetlights</p> <p>Highway safety concerns as there are no pavements and increased numbers of cars parked on the road will create further safety issues</p> <p>Highway safety concerns in relation to the existing school close by</p> <p>Proposed parking is considered insufficient for both staff and visitors</p> <p>Insufficient space for emergency vehicles to access the site</p>	<p>Concerns regarding:</p> <p>Impact of additional traffic and parking as a result of the proposed where congestion is already caused by existing schools and other local facilities</p> <p>Current public transport is not sufficient to support the proposed development</p> <p>The proposed access road is not suitable with no pavements or streetlights</p> <p>Highway safety concerns as there are no pavements and increased numbers of cars parked on the road will create further safety issues</p> <p>Highway safety concerns in relation to the existing school close by</p> <p>Proposed parking is considered insufficient for both staff and visitors</p> <p>Proposed stacking system is not appropriate parking provision</p>
<p>Infrastructure</p>	<p>Concerns regarding:</p> <p>The existing sewage infrastructure will not cope with additional development</p> <p>The proposed will cause flooding issues</p>	<p>Concerns regarding:</p> <p>Insufficient information that drainage requirements can be met</p> <p>The proposed will cause flooding issues</p>
<p>Dorset Heathlands</p>	<p>Not appropriate development near a SSSI</p>	<p>Not appropriate development near a SSSI</p>

Trees	Concerns regarding: Impact on existing trees That trees on site have been removed and not been replanted	Concerns regarding: Impact on existing trees
Construction	Concerns regarding: Insufficient parking for construction workers during construction Noise during construction and the impact on neighbours	Concerns regarding: Noise during construction and the impact on neighbours

7.0 CONSULTATIONS

The following responses were received from consultees in relation to the initially submitted and revised design.

7.01 - DC Highways

Initial Design	No objection subject to parking, access, visibility splay and a construction management condition.
Revised Design	Nothing further to add

7.02 - Verwood Town Council

Initial Design	Object - Contrary to Policy HE2, Layout & site coverage, architectural style, scale, bulk, height materials, landscaping, visual impact, relationship to nearby properties including minimising general disturbance to amenity & relationship to Mature trees. Concerns regarding traffic volume towards pedestrian safety. We also support any Previous Representations made by the East Dorset Environment Partnership
Revised	Objection still stands – Contrary to Policy HE2, Layout & site coverage, architectural style, scale, bulk, height, materials,

Design	landscaping, visual impact, relationship to nearby properties including minimising general disturbance to amenity & relationship to Mature trees. Concerns regarding traffic volume towards pedestrian safety. We also support previous representations and the new updated representation made by the East Dorset Environment Partnership.
--------	---

7.03 - CED Trees and Landscape

Initial Design	Object - The scheme remains much the same with the exceptions being the reduction in hard landscaping to the NW and carparking at the front. The initial comments made in respect of the trees on the S and SW boundaries and their significance in the landscape as well as their sensitivity to the change, remains unaddressed. The BS has been followed to a point but without any notion that the retained trees root spread will inevitably be more concentrated within the site due to the proximity of structures off site. The scheme is, or least gives the impression of pressure for car spaces due the proposed use of hydraulic parking lifts in order to get additional spaces, this is a situation which could only increase. Simply covering an area with hard scaping, using a CFS and putting a roof over those parking spaces shown under the trees only enforces the tree implications/constraints. These areas must be reduced as previously stated. To address these points the parking and possibly the site layout re-evaluating with a more sympathetic approach and design.
Revised Design	No objection - Amended plans are acceptable in tree terms subject to receiving an updated Arb report to be secured by condition.

7.04 - Lead Flood Authority

Initial Design	<p>The following areas have still not been addressed, hence we maintain our Holding Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The revised Drainage Strategy (DS) submitted appears confused with respect to climate change. Paragraph 3.13 states: <i>“Guidance given in “Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances” for a development in Flood Zone 1 suggests that a climate change allowance of 20% should be applied.”</i> Whilst paragraph 4.10 states: <i>“The new surface water drainage system, whether discharging to soakaways or the existing watercourse, will be designed to accommodate a 1 in 100 year rainfall event including a 30% uplift for climate change.”</i> To be clear, as per the following guidance, the applicant should offer a 40% allowance for climate change: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances. If the 20% or 30% lower bound is to be used then the applicant will need to do an impact analysis which demonstrates what will happen in the event that 40%
----------------	---

	<p>increases in intensity are observed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SSP have still not provided the provisional drainage calculations, as requested in our previous email. - The applicant has proposed an acceptable “plan B” discharge route and has suggested that if this drainage methodology is needed, then on-site attenuation will be stored in an above ground pond. No provisional layout including this pond has been supplied, as such we are unable to ascertain whether this is feasible. This is particularly important as, given the layout proposed, it is not clear how space for an open storage will be found. - We still note that no comment has been made with respect to who will own and maintain the drainage systems proposed.
Revised Design	<p>No objection - Additional information submitted with the revised design provides the necessary detail to substantiate the proposed Surface Water strategy. We therefore have no objection to the application subject to surface water conditions and informatives</p>

7.05 - East Dorset Environment Partnership

Initial Design	<p>Object - EDEP maintains its objection to this proposed development. It still lacks essential information and has failed to address adequately the reasons for refusal of the previous application (3/19/0341/OUT). In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lack of adequate scope for the accommodation of a landscaping scheme and impact on the street scene - The need to ensure no disturbance of the RPAs of the protected trees - Inadequate information and conflicting proposals on how drainage and flood risk issues will be addressed - As this is a revised application, a revised BMEP should be submitted for approval. <p>On the evidence provided, the proposals fail to meet economic, social and environmental sustainability requirements.</p>
Revised Design	<p>Previous objection still stands.</p> <p>In relation to revised information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tree and Drainage information are incompatible - Concerns regarding tree information provided - Concerns regarding drainage information provided

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape hedging info is incorrect - Internal living conditions still unacceptable
--	--

7.06 - Dorset Waste Partnership

Initial Design	None received
Revised Design	Proposed waste collection does not meet Dorset Waste Partnership requirements

7.07 - Dorset Wildlife Trust

Initial Design	Object - Insufficient information on the revised scheme provided to comment on biodiversity impacts.
Revised Design	Object - No updated ecological assessment and no BMEP

7.08 - Dorset Social Care Team

Initial Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need in East Dorset is for acute levels of Dementia Care - Data on market position doesn't match up with our Brokerage Searches - which indicated 9 dementia homes within 5 miles of Verwood - Concern that design doesn't appear to have regard to modern Dementia Friendly design standards. - No consideration of smaller household units within the home - Concern about long-term commercial viability of a home of this size - Concern for sustainable pricing of Dementia Care in this area.
Revised Design	None received

7.09 - Natural England

Initial Design	<p>No objection subject to condition</p> <p><i>Matters Concerning Protected Sites</i></p> <p>The application site lies within 400m of heathland that forms part of the Verwood Heaths Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The site also lies in the vicinity of other heathlands that are notified as SSSIs for the special interest of their heathland habitats and associated plant and animal species.</p> <p>Much of the heathland SSSI area is part of the Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA) on account of rare or vulnerable heathland bird species and is also part of a Ramsar site on account of rare or vulnerable heathland wetlands and associated rare wetland species. The SSSIs are additionally part of the Dorset Heaths Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) on account of rare or vulnerable heathland and associated habitats and some individual species.</p> <p>The application is for a use which can remove the likelihood of adverse impacts on the designated sites resulting from residential dwellings, subject to development design and likely dependency of patients. The patients at the care home will require a high level of dependency to enable the development to be permitted within 400m of a heathland. This is clearly intended through the DAS and design of accommodation of this application. Natural England consider the following controls to be appropriate to enable your authority to approve this development and conclude no adverse impact on the integrity of the designated sites.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Predatory pets are one of the causes of adverse impact on the designated sites resulting from additional dwellings. Care homes within 400m are managed and able to restrict/enforce the ownership of pets in a reasonable manor. To enable your authority to permit this development, a restriction on pet ownership is likely to be necessary. This could be secured through planning conditions.2. The application includes a small number of parking spaces for staff and visitors. Public parking within 400m of a heathland is likely to result in additional visits to the heathland by members of the public, specifically by dog walkers. Although it is recognised that the parking is intended for the use of the staff and visitors, a sign at the entrance to identify that the parking spaces are for visitors and staff only would
----------------	---

	<p>be an appropriate mitigation measure. This could be secured through planning conditions.</p> <p>3. The high dependency dementia patients require a secure outdoor space that removes the possibility that a patient will leave the site unaccompanied. This also acts as an infrastructure safeguard for the intended patient dependency level that is necessary for this type of use to be lawful within 400m of a heathland. Details of the boundary specification of the secure outdoor space should be submitted to and approved in writing by your authority. This could be secured through planning conditions to be agreed at reserved matters.</p> <p>In the absence of such controls, your authority may be unable to conclude no adverse impact on the integrity of the designated sites. If your authority is unable to secure these measures, please re-consult us and our advice is likely to be amended to an objection.</p> <p><i>Matters Concerning Biodiversity</i></p> <p>Natural England note the submission of a Certificate of Approval dated 30/09/19 from Dorset Council’s Natural Environment Team. In this case, providing the submitted Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, and its implementation in full, is secured through a condition as part of the grant of planning permission, Natural England agree with the opinion of the Natural Environment Team of Dorset Council that the planning authority will have met their duties under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and Regulation 9(3) of The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017</p>
<p>Revised Design</p>	<p>N/A – reconsult not required</p>

7.10 - NHS Dorset (DCCG) - None received

7. 11 - County Rights Of Way Officer - None received

8.0 APPRAISAL

8.01 The main planning considerations for this application are:

- The principle of a Care Home development
- Impact on the character of the area

- Impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring properties
- The standard of residential amenity for proposed occupants
- Impact of the proposal on trees
- Impact of the proposal on flood risk
- Impact on Dorset Heathlands
- Impact on Biodiversity
- Impact on highways

8.02 These points and other material considerations are discussed under the headings below.

Principle of development

8.03 The site lies within the urban area where the principle of development is acceptable. Verwood is identified in Local Plan policy KS2 as a Main Settlement where residential and other development will be focused. The proposal would provide 29 additional units of accommodation which would contribute to delivering a sufficient supply of homes within the Local Plan area. It is estimated that the provision of 29 care home bedrooms has the potential to release approx. 16 units of accommodation within the district, contributing to the housing supply.

8.04 Concerns have been raised by neighbours that there is no need for additional care homes in this location. The Adult Social Care Team confirmed under previously refused applications that there are already a number of care homes in the vicinity. Core Strategy policy LN6 requires that *'New social, care or health related development proposals, or major extensions to existing developments, within the C2 use classification will not be subject to Policy LN3 (Affordable Housing) however they will be required to demonstrate that any impacts upon, or risks to, the strategic aims and objectives of Dorset County Council and NHS Dorset health and social care services have been taken into account and mitigated against.'*

8.05 The applicant has provided supporting information and data regarding the need for care homes catering for persons with acute dementia in this area, which were not disputed by the Adult Social Care Team in the previously refused applications. Issues were raised initially regarding the detailed design of the care home and how it meets those needs, however a revised design has been submitted and there is no objection in principle. The NHS have also been consulted but have not responded. However, it is noted in their response to the previously refused application they did not identify any risk to their services as a result of this development. The principle of development is therefore found to be acceptable.

Impact on the character of the area

8.06 The proposal is for a 2-3 storey, plus basement, care home. The building would take the general shape of a 'T', with three storey elements to the south

and west of the site, stepping down to a two and single storey elements to the north adjacent to 9 Edmondsham Road. The building would also include a curved single story café to the western elevation. The building would include a basement level, where ancillary staff and operational spaces would be provided.

- 8.07 The existing character of the area is generally mixed with varying architectural forms and styles depending on the use of the area. To the north of the site are detached and semi-detached two storey properties. To the west of the site is a group of three bungalows. With the town centre boundary to the south, Station Road comprises a mixture of two storey dwellings and two-three storey properties with commercial units at ground level with some residential accommodation above. Three story flats are located directly opposite the site at Fayrewood Court.
- 8.08 Concerns have been raised by third parties the proposed scale and bulk is out of keeping with the character of the area. The previously refused applications, after pre-application advice, were considered by officers to be generally acceptable architecturally given the mixed nature of the character of the area with commercial and residential uses and varying heights of up to three storeys. Issues with the bulk that would project at three storeys to the rear/west of the site and be viewable from the private drive outside nos. 8-12 Station Road as well as glimpsed from Station Road itself in the gaps between buildings was not considered detrimental enough to warrant refusal. Notwithstanding this assessment of the previously refused applications, the revised design somewhat improves the bulk and massing, particularly at first floor level, where the floor area has been reduced from approximately 540m² to 460m².
- 8.09 As per the previously refused applications, the site is proposed to be developed intensively, and while this in itself is not contrary to policy, there were issues that resulted from the proposed intensity of use that are not were not previously acceptable (as per the application refused in November 2019). As per the most recently refused application, the site plan shows a parking strategy with frontage parking divided and broken up by landscaping which overcomes previous reasons for refusal. It is acknowledged that landscaping is a reserved matter but the officer is satisfied that space for sufficient landscaping is provided. Given the level of development on the proposed site it is considered necessary to remove permitted development rights to ensure the site is capable of accommodating the proposed level of accommodation (condition 14).
- 8.10 Proposed materials of brick, render and tile are considered to be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area but it is considered necessary to condition that samples of materials are provided (condition 18) as the specification of these materials have not been provided.

- 8.11 Concerns were also raised that the proposed would result is light pollution that would impact negatively on the character of the area. As noted previously the application site is within the urban area and in close proximity to the town centre boundary, where external lighting already exists. It is also noted the approved and conditioned BMEP (condition 13) requires external lighting to be kept to a minimum with lights, to be hooded to avoid light spill and to be operated by motion sensors.
- 8.12 The proposed is generally acceptable architecturally and the revised layout overcomes previous reasons for refusal. With the conditions in this report the proposed scheme is not considered to have a demonstrable impact on the character of the area that would warrant refusal and is therefore considered acceptable.

Impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring properties

- 8.13 Concerns have been raised that the proposed would result in overlooking of neighbouring amenity, loss of light for neighbouring properties, additional noise and concerns regarding the location of the bins store.
- 8.14 As per the previous refused application, the proposed care home is situated in close proximity to the neighbouring dwelling at no. 9. However, the separation distances at each storey to the neighbouring has been revised as follows:

Previously Refused 3/19/2163/OUT	Proposed
Ground floor – 0-11m	Ground floor – 1.6-11m
First floor – 2.8-15	First floor – 8.7-15m
Second floor - 15 -17.5m	Second floor – 15 -17.5m

- 8.15 The previously refused applications considered the construction of the care home would lead to a loss of light and outlook from no. 9 which would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of this dwelling. With the reduction to the floor area at first floor level the proposed separation at this level has been improved by just over 6m. This is considered to be a significant improvement and now creates a bulk and massing that would not have a demonstrable impact on the outlook of the neighbouring property that would warrant refusal. A light impact study has been also provided to show that there will be no undue restriction in line with the BRE guidance set out in the BRE 2011 site layout and planning for daylight and sunlight.
- 8.16 Previously, the design of the care home included an external amenity space for use by the 38 occupants that was located 2m from the boundary. With the removal of basement bedrooms this space has also been removed and improves the relationship to the neighbouring property at number 9.

- 8.17 As per the previously refused applications, the relationship to other neighbouring boundaries to the south and west are considered acceptable, where separation distances are sufficient and any windows above ground floor level that may directly overlook neighbouring amenity space are at least 10m from the neighbouring boundary.
- 8.17 It is acknowledged that two windows at first and second floor levels are approximately 4.5m from the neighbouring boundary to the south. However, these are considered acceptable where there will only be oblique views of neighbouring amenity space and proposed windows are approximately 25m from the neighbouring dwelling.
- 8.18 Concerns have also been raised regarding noise and disturbance in relation to the proposed use, provision of café and the location of the bin store. The proposed kitchen is located in the basement and is some 13m from the closest neighbouring boundary. Details of plant and servicing have been conditioned to be provided prior to commencement to ensure it does not impact negatively neighbouring amenity (conditions 16 & 17).
- 8.19 With the kitchen located in the basement, the proposed café will be mainly for serving and dining. There is only one opening to the north which is approximately 11m from the neighbouring boundary.
- 8.20 It is acknowledged that the proposed bin store is within close proximity of the neighbouring adjacent boundary. Due to issues with protected trees it has proved necessary to locate this here. However the proposed bin store is a fully enclosed structure, some 25m from the neighbouring dwelling and is therefore considered acceptable.

The standard of residential amenity for proposed occupants

- 8.21 Concerns were raised by the Dorset Social Care Team in response to previously refused applications regarding the suitability of the proposed accommodation for use as a dementia care home due to the proposed internal layout and the lack of a modern approach to living arrangements. However, on balance the standard of amenity was not considered so inadequate as to form a reason for refusal in previous applications.
- 8.22 In addition, there were concerns over the proposed accommodation at basement level comprising the outdoor amenity space and the basement bedrooms, which did form a reason for refusal in the most recently refused application. The living conditions of basement rooms was considered to be wholly unacceptable, particularly for dementia care patients whose principal living space would be these rooms and formed a reason for approval. Proposed basement rooms and amenity space have now been removed in the revised design, removing this previous reason for refusal

- 8.23 The Dorset Social Care Team have not responded to the reconsultation on the revised design and while a more modern approach to dementia care living could still be applied to the internal layout, as per the previously refused applications, on balance the standard of design is not considered so inadequate as to form a reason for refusal.

Impact of the proposal on trees

- 8.24 The site includes a number of mature trees on the southern boundary and is covered by a site-wide TPO. Concerns have been raised by neighbours, Verwood Town Council and the EDEP regarding the impact on trees. A number of issues were identified by the Council's Tree and Landscape Officer in relation to the Arboricultural information submitted as part of the previously refused applications.
- 8.25 The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has been consulted on the revised design and after some negotiation in relation to hard landscaping and parking space locations, the tree officer is now satisfied that the previous reason for refusal has been overcome subject to a pre-commencement condition to provide an updated tree report (condition 12).

Impact on Highways

- 8.26 The main vehicular access would be taken off Edmondsham Road towards the south of the site, providing access to a car park. The parking within the car park would include nine bays located within a stacking system, for use by staff only, a further 10 spaces (7 within the car park and 3 spaces off Edmondsham Road), cycle parking, ambulance bay and bin store. The proposals for access to the care home, including access for emergency vehicles, have been considered by the Highways Authority and found to be acceptable subject to conditions, including a condition relating to a Construction Traffic Management Plan to manage the impacts of vehicular movements and parking during construction, which have been imposed (conditions 4-9).
- 8.27 Concerns have been raised by third parties that the proposed does not provide sufficient parking and that there are highways safety concerns given the proximity to the First School and lack of street lighting and pavements surrounding the application site.
- 8.28 The level of parking proposed in the previously refused applications were considered in accordance with the requirements of Policy KS12 and the Local Transport Plan at 23 spaces for 37 beds. 19 parking spaces are currently proposed for 29 beds.
- 8.29 The Dorset Council requirement for parking for a residential care home is 1 space per 4 beds and 1 per 2 full time staff. The number of beds have been reduced from 38 to 29 and the agent has confirmed by email that the number

of staff will reduce to 20 full time staff as a result. Therefore the number of parking spaces required as per Dorset Council parking standards is:

29 beds = 7.25 spaces

20 staff = 10 spaces

TOTAL SPACES REQUIRED – 17.25 spaces

TOTAL SPACES PROVIDED – 19 spaces

- 8.30 9 of these spaces are part of the proposed stacking system, these spaces will be allocated to staff only. DC Highways are satisfied with this provision and have imposed a condition to ensure the correct installation and maintenance of the system (condition 6).
- 8.31 DC Highways have raised no concerns on highway safety grounds subject to condition (condition 4-9). The impact on highways and proposed parking provision is therefore found to be acceptable.

Impact of the proposal on flood risk and sustainable drainage

- 8.32 Concerns have been raised by neighbours that the proposed would create a flood risk to the area. The site is located with fluvial flood zone 1, however, there is a risk of fluvial flooding to parts of the site. The building itself would not be within an area at risk of pluvial flooding so it is not considered that a sequential test is required in relation to this proposal.
- 8.33 The Lead Flood Authority (LFA) originally raised concerns regarding the level of detail provided in relation to drainage and flood information. The original submission failed to meet national guidance in relation to climate change and did not include the required 40% allowance; drainage calculations had not been provided as requested in the previously refused application. While the LFA considered there to be an acceptable “plan B” discharge route, provisional details had not been provided with the application and as such the LFA were unable to ascertain whether this was feasible.
- 8.34 The additional information requested by the LFA was subsequently provided by applicant and the LFA confirmed by e-mail dated 1 June 2020 that the additional information submitted with the revised design provides the necessary detail to substantiate the proposed Surface Water strategy. The LFA therefore have no objection to the application subject to surface water conditions and informative (conditions 10 & 11).
- 8.35 Foul water is proposed to be disposed of via the mains sewer and this application did not trigger the requirement to consult Wessex Water.

Impact on the Dorset Heathlands

- 8.36 The application site lies within 400m to 5km of Dorset Heathland which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest and as a European wildlife site. The proposal for a 29 bed care home, in combination with other plans and projects and in the absence of avoidance and mitigation measures, is likely to have a significant effect on the site. It has therefore been necessary for the Council, as the appropriate authority, to undertake an appropriate assessment of the implications for the protected site, in view of the site's conservation objectives.
- 8.37 The appropriate assessment has concluded that avoidance measures in the form of conditions and planning obligation could prevent adverse impacts on the integrity of the site. It would be necessary to limit the residential occupancy of the site to those with dementia or the requirement for 24 hour close care, restrict more than 1 member of staff from sleeping at the care home, restrict pets on the site and require the proposed parking to be limited to care home staff and visitors. A Legal Agreement dated 21 April 2020 has been provided by the applicant which secures these measures (informative 2).

Impact on Biodiversity

- 8.38 Concerns have been raised by EDEP and the Dorset Wildlife Trust that an up to date biodiversity plan was not submitted with the application. Subsequently a Dorset NET signed BMEP has been provided and dated 12 May 2020. It is noted that changes where hard landscaping has been reduced and parking provisions reconfigured slightly since the BMEP was submitted. Therefore it is not the most up to date plan in the approved BMEP but changes are minor and have been made to hard landscaping only to address tree concerns and do not affect the provisions of the proposed BMEP. The proposed BMEP is secured by condition (condition 13).

Waste Management

- 8.39 Dorset Waste Partnership (DWP) has advised that the proposed bin store location does not meet their requirements for waste collection. The agent has advised a private waste collection service will be used and it is therefore not necessary to meet the requirements of the DWP. A condition has been imposed to ensure this (condition 15).

9. CONCLUSION

- 9.01 Reasons for refusal in the previously refused application 3/19/0341/OUT and 3/19/2163/OUT have now been addressed to extent that the proposed is no longer demonstrably harmful to the character of the area and the amenity of neighbouring occupants, in particular at no. 9 Edmondsham Road. The previous reasons for refusal in relation to trees and living standards have also be overcome by the reduction of hard landscaping and removal of bedroom accommodation in the basement. Finally sufficient drainage information has been provided to overcome previous drainage concerns.

9.02 The application is therefore recommended for approval.

10.0 HUMAN RIGHTS

10.1 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

10.2 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.

11.0 PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITIES DUTY

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

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

11.2 Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove OR minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the PSED.

12.0 CLIMATE IMPLICATIONS

12.1 The proposal would increase the number of vehicle trips to the application site. However, more sustainable transport options are also available as the application site is located within close proximity to the town centre boundary where there are public transport links and cycle parking is also provided.

12.2 Existing protected trees are retained on site. One non-native Douglas Fir tree will be lost but will be replaced by a cherry tree.

12.3 The main climate impacts will be result of increased vehicle trips. This is generally expected with new development and given the options of alternative more sustainable transport options the proposed is considered acceptable.

Recommendation: Approve, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions/Reasons:

[All pre-commencement conditions have been agreed by the agent by email on 3 June 2020]

1. (a) Before any development is commenced details of all 'Reserved Matters', that is the following matters in respect of which details have not been given in the application and which relate to the landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
(b) An application for approval of any 'Reserved Matters' must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
(c) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the Reserved Matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: (a) This condition is required to be imposed by the provisions of Article 5(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015: (1) of the (b) and (c) These conditions are required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

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

J18067 001 Rev F Proposed Basement Floor Plan
J18067 002 Rev M Proposed Ground Floor Plan
J18067 003 Rev L Proposed First Floor Plan
J18067 004 Rev L Proposed Second Floor Plan
J18067 005 Rev G Proposed Front Elevation
J18067 006 Rev E Proposed Rear Elevation
J18067 007 Rev F Proposed Side Elevation
J18067 008 Rev F Proposed Side Elevation
J18067 009 Rev G Proposed Street Elevation
J18067 010 Rev F Section AA
J18067 011 Rev E Section BB
J18067 012 Rev L Block and Location Plan
J18067 013 Rev E Bin Store Details

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

3. No development above DPC (damp proof course) shall take place until details and samples of all external facing and roofing materials have been provided on site, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). All works shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA.

Reason: This information is required prior to above ground work commencing to ensure satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing.

4. Before the development is occupied or utilised the first 5.00 metres of each vehicular access, measured from the rear edge of the highway (excluding the vehicle crossing – see the Informative Note below), must be laid out and constructed to a specification submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

5. Before the development is occupied or utilised the areas shown on Drawing Number J18067-012 L for the manoeuvring, parking, loading and unloading of vehicles have been surfaced, marked out and made available for these purposes. Thereafter, these areas must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

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

6. Before the development is occupied or utilised multi-parking lift shown on Drawing Number J18067-012 L must have been constructed in accordance with the submitted technical specification (multibase G63 by KLAUS Multiparking). Thereafter, this parking system must be permanently maintained and available.

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

7. The development hereby permitted must not be occupied or utilised until a scheme showing precise details of the proposed cycle parking facilities is submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The location of the cycle shelter shall be as shown on Drawing Number J18067-012 L. Any such scheme requires approval to be obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme must be constructed before the development is commenced and, thereafter, must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper construction of the parking facilities and to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes.

8. Before the development commences a scheme showing precise details for the provision of visibility splays at the proposed access to the site must be submitted to the Planning Authority. Any such scheme requires approval to be obtained in writing from the Planning Authority. The approved scheme must be

constructed before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied or is brought into use and will require the visibility splays to be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.6 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway and must thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstructions.

Reason: To ensure that a vehicle can see or be seen when exiting the access.

9. Before the development hereby approved commences a Construction Method Statement (CMS) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMS must include:

- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- delivery, demolition and construction working hours

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

Reason: to minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network.

10. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and including clarification of how surface water is to be managed during construction, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is completed.

Reason To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and to improve habitat and amenity.

11. No development shall take place until details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system have been 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 should 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 future maintenance of the surface water drainage system, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

12. Notwithstanding the details submitted, an up-to-date arboricultural method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority, prior to the commencement of the demolition/development. All works shall subsequently be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details. The method statement must provide the following:

- a specification and plan showing the extent and positioning of protective measures including ground protection and fencing to trees during demolition and construction which complies with BS5837:2012;
- a specification for any works associated with the development in the tree protection zones;
- the locations suitable for storage of materials, site hut/office, concrete mixing, use of fires and service runs;
- cross sections including existing and proposed levels detailing any changes in levels within tree protection zones on/adjacent to the site;
- full details of surfacing, materials, colours, edging, bollards, stones, walling or any other means of enclosure;

The approved details shall be implemented in full and the hard landscaping completed in all respects prior to the first occupation/use of the development and thereafter retained.

Reason: This information is required prior to commencement of development in the interests of tree protection and to accord with Policies HE2 and HE3 of the Core Strategy.

13. The development hereby approved shall not be first brought into use unless and until the mitigation measures as detailed in the approved mitigation plan (ABR Ecology) dated 15.04.20 have been completed in full, unless any modifications to the agreed mitigation plan as a result of the requirements of a European Protected Species Licence, or the results of subsequent bat surveys have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter approved mitigations measures shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of nature conservation.

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any subsequent enactment or re-enactment thereto, no enlargements, improvements or other alterations (including the insertion of a mezzanine floor) shall be undertaken to the building without express planning permission first being obtained.

Reason: To ensure that the site is capable of accommodating the proposed building.

15. Prior to the first occupation of the care home, details of storage for refuse and recycling, together with the access to it including details of a private refuse

collection solution, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The storage shall be provided in accordance with the agreed details before the development is first occupied and thereafter retained as approved. Furthermore unless agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority the approved private refuse collection solution shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, visual amenity and the amenities of future occupiers of the development.

16. Prior to the commencement of the development of the care home, hereby permitted, a noise assessment for any external plant/condensers shall be conducted in accordance with BS4142:2014 for all plant including fans associated with the extract system, refrigeration condensers, air conditioning units and any other plant likely to be audible at neighbouring premises from the care home. The assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme (together with any required measures) shall be installed to the agreed specification prior to the first use, and maintained and operated in that condition thereafter.

Reason: to protect neighbouring amenity of adjoining neighbouring properties

17. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme containing full details of arrangements for internal air extraction, odour control, and discharge to atmosphere from cooking operations, including any external ducting and flues, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works detailed in the approved scheme shall be installed in their entirety before the use hereby permitted is commenced. The equipment shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and operated at all times when cooking is being carried.

Reason: to protect neighbouring amenity of adjoining neighbouring properties

18. No development above DPC (damp proof course) shall take place until details and samples of all external facing and roofing materials have been provided on site, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). All works shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA.

Reason: This information is required prior to above ground work commencing to ensure satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing.

Informatives:

1. The applicant needs to be aware that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be applied to development on this site. The amount of levy due will be calculated at the time the reserved matters application is submitted.
2. This grant of permission is to be read in conjunction with the Legal Agreement dated 21 April 2020 entered into between Dorset Council and Peter Martin Miller / Helen Louise Miller / Fayrewood Property Limited.
3. The vehicle crossing serving this proposal (that is, the area of highway land between the nearside carriageway edge and the site's road boundary) must be constructed to the specification of the Highway Authority in order to comply with Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant should contact Dorset Highways by telephone at Dorset Direct (01305 221000), by email at dorsetdirect@dorsetcc.gov.uk, or in writing at Dorset Highways, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the public highway.
4. Prior Land Drainage Consent (LDC) may be required from DC's FRM team, as relevant LLFA, for all works that offer an obstruction to flow to a channel or stream with the status of Ordinary Watercourse (OWC) – in accordance with s23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. The modification, amendment or realignment of any OWC associated with the proposal under consideration, is likely to require such permission. We would encourage the applicant to submit, at an early stage, preliminary details concerning in-channel works to the FRM team. LDC enquires can be sent to floodriskmanagement@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk.