

FONTMELL MAGNA PARISH COUNCIL

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2/2020/0577

Prepared by Jo Witherden BSc(Hons) DipTP DipUD MRTPI on behalf of Fontmell Magna Parish Council, June 2020

PLANNING APPLICATION 2/2020/0577

The planning application is for full permission for the development of land at Home Farm, for 30 homes and a school drop off area together with associated parking, access and landscaping works, diversion of the public foot path at the northern end of the site.

The Parish Council strongly supports the scheme in principle, but considers that, as currently proposed, a number of changes are required. In particular, more thought needs to be given to the designs to ensure that the scheme respects the distinctive character of the village and its status as a conservation area, and there are a number of detailed points specified in the Neighbourhood Plan policies that need to be addressed. It is on these grounds that the Parish Council's objections are made. There are also a number of areas which lack clarity or could be improved upon. It is hoped that amendments can be made to the scheme prior to its determination, that would address all of these points. The Parish Council would welcome a chance to comment further on any proposed changes, and hopes that it would then be able to offer its full support.

The application takes forward the main site allocation of the made Fontmell Magna Neighbourhood Plan. The main Neighbourhood Plan policy in this respect is **Policy FM19. Land South of Home Farm (Site 20)**, which has the following criteria:

- a) Land south of Home Farm, as shown on Map 12, is allocated for housing and the provision of a public car parking area to be designed to assist the needs of the school at drop-off and collection times.
- b) The total number of dwellings should not exceed 30 units and will comprise a mix of open market and affordable housing in line with Local Plan policies, and a range of house types and sizes in accordance with Policy FM16 Housing Types.
- c) Design and layout, scale, massing and materials should respect the vernacular character of Fontmell Magna, in accordance with Policies FM8 and FM9, and will be based on a thorough understanding of the character of the Conservation Area and views from the AONB.
- d) The layout, scale and design, including landscaping requirements, will be required to minimise the visual impact of development as seen from the strip lynchets on Sutton Hill and provide an attractive entrance and edge to the village as seen from the approach along the A350. This should include a substantial landscaped edge along the south-west and south-east boundaries, and a pepper-potting of green landscaped spaces within the site. The design must enable the retention of the tree belt along the northern boundary
- e) The hedgerows are potentially important as wildlife corridors and a biodiversity appraisal together with a biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan will be required as stated in policy FM2 Local Wildlife Corridors and Protected Species.
- f) A flood risk assessment must be undertaken as stated in Policy FM11 Sustainable Drainage.
- g) A parking area for 20 cars for parents of school children should be provided in the area close to the site entrance off the A350, with a new footpath link to the School that avoids crossing roads. Provision must also be made in the northern corner of the site closest to the school for coach drop-off and collection.

- h) Vehicular access will be provided via a new junction off the A350, designed in a manner appropriate to the Conservation Area and Rural Roads Protocol, and with the aim of reducing traffic speeds of all vehicles travelling in both directions along the A350 to under 30mph.
- i) The layout of the development should include a road and pedestrian access connecting to Land at Blandfords Farm Barn (as defined in Policy 20).

The main issues identified are as follows, and are detailed (with further explanation and links to the relevant policies) in the following pages. A list of other areas for consideration (that do not necessarily amount to objections) is also summarised below.

MAIN CONCERNS / POINTS OF OBJECTION:

- a) The design and layout does not respect the local, vernacular character of Fontmell Magna adequately, and fails to create safe and attractive open spaces, in particular:
 - There is too much similarity in the plot sizes, particularly in the larger plots of similar width along the western boundary, and the 4 pairs of semi-detached dwellings clustered on the eastern boundary;
 - The buildings do not relate well to the roads (many of the buildings are notably parallel to each other rather than orientating themselves to follow the line of the street) – this is particularly noticeable for Plots 7 – 10 and 19 – 26;
 - The dwellings adjoining the open spaces (with the exception of the attenuation area) do not create positive relationship with those spaces, not only including blank facades but by providing no direct connection (e.g. doors and windows opening onto the space) which severely limits the degree of social ownership and pride in those places;
 - Whilst the provision of bungalows is welcomed in the housing mix, their design is inappropriate for the local vernacular, and fails to contribute to the character of the Conservation Area;
 - The use of materials and detailing in the designs fails to respect the local character. There is an over-dominance of brick, too many blank facades, a lack of chimneys, the pitch and overhang of the roofs needs to be altered to more closely reflect local character, and the window specifications are poorly designed (as far as can be gauged from the limited details available). The overall impact is too monotonous in terms of materials and design features (appearing quite obviously as a single estate).
- b) The proposed landscaping along the south-eastern and eastern edge of the development is not substantial and fails to achieve an appropriate transition edge to the countryside.
- c) There are several areas where there is the potential for issues of overlooking between neighbouring properties.
- d) The housing mix does not make any effective provision for young working individuals. Also, plots 19 – 26 are all proposed as affordable housing, which goes against the requirement for affordable housing to be integrated and indistinguishable within the development.
- e) The site boundary excludes an area to the north-west corner of the site that was deliberately included in the site allocation in order to enable the onward route connection to Site 22. This connection is an important element of the policy to provide a more permeable network and access within the village, and it is important that this omission is rectified.
- f) Given the complex nature of the groundwater and surface water flood risk in the area, it is important that the ground investigation works are carried out prior to finalising the designs.

- g) Any necessary upgrades to the sewage treatment works need to be in place prior to the site's occupation – the timing is critical to avoid future problems, and therefore confirmation on this point needs to be sought before the application is determined.
- h) There are concerns about the safety of vehicles exiting the site and turning south, particularly given the volume of traffic on the main road (which would appear to be a car every 5 seconds in both directions at peak times) and the fact that this flow will not be 'relieved' by cars waiting to turn into the site from the south-bound carriageway. Indeed, the chosen design does little to reduce the speed of vehicles to under 30mph, although this is specified in the policy. We would welcome the highway's consideration of this point and if any further, more innovative, measures could be incorporated that might slow north-bound traffic (in particular) at this point, in a manner appropriate to its location at the entrance of the Conservation Area.

OTHER AREAS FOR CLARIFICATION / POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENT:

- i) The housing mix could include one or two short terraces, which can be found in the Conservation Area (usually limited to three cottages) – this could improve the character of the development as well as helping in terms of the affordability of the housing.
- ii) The character of the roads and pavements requires more detailed consideration. As specified in Policy FM5, the character of rural roads is deemed to include the hedgerows and the absence of raised kerbs and footpaths at the roadside, and Policy FM6 picks up on the required absence of street lighting. Whilst the provision of a pavement and lack of street lighting as shown on the designs is welcome, the detailed design needs to take into account the specific characteristics of this area, and we would ask for confirmation that this will not include 'urban' pavements or the introduction of streetlights.
- iii) The parking provision for Plots 11 – 14 are all in-line (i.e. one behind the other) which is more likely to lead to a degree of on-street parking due to the limited convenience of this layout type. We would welcome this being resolved, or the street design reviewed to allow more ready parking outside which would not end up overlapping with the pavement (that could potentially be moved to the eastern side of the carriageway).
- iv) Whilst electric car charging points are not specified in the Neighbourhood Plan, we are conscious of the Government's consultation that proposes requiring provision of such charging points in all new dwellings. From the plans, it would appear that this should be feasible, but we would welcome confirmation that this point has been considered.
- v) There are no indications within the design of any photovoltaic panels on roofs – and confirmation that the Building Regulations requirements can be met without the need for these to be retrofitted would be welcomed. In particular, some of the garages might lend themselves to panelled roofs.
- vi) It is important that the landscaping buffers allow for tree sizes that can mature to provide a significant contribution to the wider village-scape. There are insufficient details on this in the proposed plans to provide the certainty we would like on this point.
- vii) The decision to install either bird or bat boxes in every dwelling is broadly welcomed, but it would provide greater enhancement if both bird and bat boxes were installed in every dwelling.
- viii) It is not clear from the plans where the 3700m² species rich grassland is proposed – it would be useful to clarify if this is provided for as part of the open spaces within the site (suitably seeded and managed) as there are no clear plans showing the site areas.
- ix) It is not clear who will be responsible for maintaining the open spaces and biodiversity features in the long term, and whilst a management company may well be set up (as suggested in the S106 heads of terms) some of the site boundary features may well form parts of individual properties.

- x) If there is a need to liaise with the three landowners of the public right of way linking to the school to secure agreement of its resurfacing, we understand they have not as yet been approached.

CHECKLIST: HAVE THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICY CRITERIA BEEN MET?

QUANTUM AND MIX OF DEVELOPMENT

- a) Land south of Home Farm, as shown on Map 12, is allocated for housing and the provision of a public car parking area to be designed to assist the needs of the school at drop-off and collection times.

The description of the proposed development is for housing and a school drop-off area together with associated parking etc. The details of these are dealt with under other criteria. The main variation from the plan on this point, is that although the site area is broadly as shown in Map 12, it excludes an area to the north-west corner of the site that was drawn to enable the onward route connection to Site 22.

- b) The total number of dwellings should not exceed 30 units and will comprise a mix of open market and affordable housing in line with Local Plan policies, and a range of house types and sizes in accordance with Policy FM16 Housing Types.

30 dwellings are proposed. The proposed mix (as set out in the application form) is as follows:

	1 bedroom	2 bedroom	3 bedroom	4+ bedroom	Total
Open market	0	2	9	7	18
Social	0	8	0	0	8
Intermediate	0	0	4	0	4
Total	0	10	13	7	30

Policy FM16 requires 60% of the affordable homes to be provided as 1 and 2 bedroom homes and 40% as 3+ bedroom homes. This is broadly met in the proposed split (67% and 33%). The policy also requires that new open market housing should predominantly be of 1, 2 and some 3 bedroom properties, and these make up 61% of that mix. It requires that these are suitable for young working individuals and families (and capable of adaptation and extension so that residents can adapt their housing to suit their future needs without having to relocate) or suitable for older residents wishing to downsize. Two of the properties (Plots 15 and 16) are proposed as bungalows, which is welcomed. However, it is disappointing that the open market mix only includes 2x 2-bedroom (the 2 bungalows) and there are no 1-bedroom homes in any of the tenure types, which will limit the suitability of the homes provided for young working individuals.

DESIGN AND LAYOUT

- c) Design and layout, scale, massing and materials should respect the vernacular character of Fontmell Magna, in accordance with Policies FM8 and FM9, and will be based on a thorough understanding of the character of the Conservation Area and views from the AONB.

The planning application is accompanied by a heritage statement, landscape visual impact assessment (LVIA) and a design and access statement.

The heritage statement, disappointingly, is a desk-based study and despite considering the policy context makes no reference to the Neighbourhood Plan and appears to incorrectly reference the Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted in 2018). However in respect of the factors to be considered under this criteria, its strategy is based on the following:

“The masterplan and house designs have been selected with careful regard to the general historic layout and architectural heritage of Fontmell Magna and would preserve the current relationship the village has with the surrounding rural landscape.” The main point to this appears to be (under 5.11) that the “design of the residential units close to the entrance have

been carefully considered in recognition of the importance of the approach to the CA from the south. The unit that would be most prominent in this approach would be on the northern side of the access road into the study site. The design of this residence has therefore been developed to reflect the local vernacular style, including the use of flint and brick banding. Also, development density close to the entrance has been kept low, with an attenuation pond and planting positioned nearby.”

It also goes on to note that the proposed development layout ensures that the development “would not encroach into the surrounding rural fields in long views of the village from Sutton Hill and Fontmell Down, preserving the heritage value of these views as well as the setting and prominence of the Church of St Andrew” – although this in itself is inherent in the site allocation boundaries.

The design and access statement is somewhat limited in its appraisal, noting mainly that

- “The architectural character of the village is a mix of Victorian villas and older more varied buildings.
- Materials in the village comprise predominantly red brick, stone and flint for walls. Roofs of clay tile, slate and thatch all present.
- Most windows around the village are casement with glazing bars.
- Buildings tend to be 1½ - 2½ storeys, with a few exceptions.
- Roof pitches vary throughout the village with the historic village character typically around 45°, with more recent developments having shallower pitches.
- Most properties sit back from the road behind soft landscaping of shrubs and lawns, while some properties sit hard up to the street edge. Buildings do not generally follow a consistent alignment to the street, resulting in a varied street character.”

It goes on to note that “Architectural details in the village include:

- Banded brick and flint walls
- Mix of brick, flint and stone on same facade
- Prominent gabled dormers and half storey height eaves.
- Simple building forms devoid of bays, porches, etc.
- Varied roof heights, scales of building.
- Casement windows.
- Arched window headers.”

In order to consider the requirements of the policy in detail, we have taken each point from the related policy (FM8 and FM9) in turn. Policy FM8, which focuses on development layout has a number of criteria:

The layout of new development should generally reflect the pattern of existing village lanes, with a variety of plot sizes, shapes and variation in building lines, with opportunities for social interaction created by open spaces, verges and front doors and windows overlooking the street.

The proposed layout does reflect the gently curving nature of some of the village streets, but there is a degree of similarity in the plot sizes, particularly in the larger plots of similar width along the western boundary, and the 4 pairs of semi-detached dwellings clustered on the eastern boundary. There is some variation in the building line in terms of how far the buildings are set back from the road, but the orientation proposed includes a degree of rigidity (in that the buildings are notably parallel to each other rather than orientating themselves to follow the line of the street) which is particularly noticeable for Plots 7 – 10 and 19 – 26. By including more variation in the orientation, to more closely reflect the curving nature of the street, there would also be less opportunity for windows to look directly into the neighbouring property.

The open spaces within the site are welcomed, but it is unfortunate that the houses fail to take the opportunity to properly address these spaces to bring them within the social ‘ownership’ of the community. This applies to the diverted right of way along the northern boundary, the

incidental open space between plots 14 and 15, and the linking open space between plots 26 (wrongly labelled 24) and 27. To make these more part of the community the adjoining houses need to include active frontages (i.e. doors and windows) that have the capacity to open onto those spaces and allow the occupants to spill out and take some ownership and pride in those spaces. This is also covered in Neighbourhood Plan Policy FM10 which states that proposals should contribute to the safety and attractiveness of the pedestrian routes, so that more people walk rather than drive locally.

The design, layout and orientation should be appropriate to the character of the surrounding area and should avoid adverse impacts of overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

There are several areas where there is the potential for issues of overlooking between neighbouring properties, and this needs to be reviewed and resolved. The potential upper storey level overlooking between Plots 9 and 10 can, it would seem, be readily dealt with through obscure glazing on the bathrooms. There is also potential for overlooking between Plots 5 and 6, that may possibly be resolved through the re-positioning of the garage within Plot 5. The third area is between Plots 3 and 4, which perhaps could be eased by changing the garage and dwelling around on Plot 4.

Another notable point is the lack of short terraces (of usually three cottages), which is a feature of the Conservation Area and also would help in terms of the affordability of the housing.

The rather domestic 20th century design of the bungalows, in what is a prominent location within the development, fails to contribute to the character of the Conservation Area. There are many examples of single storey buildings within the Conservation areas, such as those related to farm buildings, from which design cues could be taken. A more interesting roof form would certainly be beneficial.

The character of the roads and pavements also requires more detailed consideration. As specified in Policy FM5, the character of rural roads is deemed to include the hedgerows and the absence of raised kerbs and footpaths at the roadside. Whilst the provision of a pavement as shown on the designs is welcome, the detailed design needs to take into account the specific characteristics of this area, and should avoid 'urban' pavements and the introduction of streetlights.

Particular regard should be had to the layout and landscaping of schemes proposed within the sensitive transitional areas lying between the village and the open countryside.

This is dealt with in more detail under the next criteria (d)

Off-street car-parking will normally be required for two vehicles (or one plus a garage), together with adequate access for service vehicles.

All of the plots appear to have sufficient parking in line with the guidance in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is noted that Plots 11 – 14 however are all designed as in-line (i.e. one behind the other) which is more likely to lead to a degree of on-street parking due to the limited convenience of this layout type. We would welcome this being resolved, or the street design reviewed to allow parking directly outside which would not risk ending up overlapping with the pavement (a possible solution might be to move the pavement to the eastern side of the carriageway). Policy FM10 is also relevant in this respect, given the potential onward connection of this link and the problem that too much on-street parking on this bend may cause.

Whilst electric car charging points are not specified in the Neighbourhood Plan, we are conscious of the Government's consultation that proposes that these will be required in all new dwellings. From the plans, it would appear that this should be feasible, but we would welcome confirmation that this point has been considered.

The precise location of affordable housing within a development will be determined having regard both to overall design and layout considerations (which must include

the objective of ensuring that it is indistinguishable from other housing) and to the reasonable requirements of efficient management and maintenance.

There is no indication from the plans which of the properties are to be affordable, and it is therefore difficult to be sure that these are not unduly clustered within the development. However, based on the house sizes, it would appear that Plots 19 – 26 are all proposed as affordable housing, which is considered to be undesirable if these houses are to be truly integrated into the social mix and not appear as distinctly different.

Policy FM9 focuses on building design, and states that:

New construction and alterations to buildings should respect the local rural character of the area in terms of scale, form, materials and layout, with an appropriate level of detailing to add interest and reinforce local character. Materials and detailing should have regard to the vernacular features described in the preamble to this policy, including those described in Table 3.

Roof-mounted photovoltaic panels should be frameless to reduce their visual impact and may not be appropriate where they would be clearly visible and detrimental in the context of Listed Buildings, the Conservation Area or from the AONB.

A key point that stands out from the building elevation plans and street scene cross-sections, is the overall predominance of brick, so much so that it is considered to go against the character of the Conservation Area, albeit that a number of the properties introduce flint banding. Whilst the materials palette needs to be limited, a little more variety is needed within the mix, which could include some stone or hardwood weatherboarding or rendering.

It is noted that brick is also used as the decorative element in terms of sill, lintels etc, and it will be important that this is expertly done with slightly contrasting bricks to be effective. Care also needs to be taken that such semi-decorative elements are used appropriately in the context of the building – segmental arches tight beneath eaves are not necessary (as they carry no load in this situation) and therefore appear out of place.

Many of the properties also lack chimneys, and these are importance to the character of the area - they provide visual interest, are useful for concealing boiler flues should the need arise, and can also support satellite dishes and aerials in a less intrusive fashion than having these placed on the walls.

Further attention also needs to be paid to the approach taken on the eaves and degree of overhanging, noting that eaves heights are relatively low with 55% being below the head of the upper windows. As a guide, it would be appropriate for eaves to project beyond external wall faces by a minimum of 400mm. This in turn allows the first floor window heads to rise above eaves level (because the extra projection of the eaves brings the eaves closer to ground level), which is typical of the local vernacular. Similarly, the roofs should project out over gable ends by at least 400mm and expose purlins (as shown in the Design and Access Statement perspective on P14). The roof pitch also needs to be reconsidered on some of the plans – the local vernacular tends to be at least 45%, whereas a number of the designs (eg House Types C - F) are clearly under 45%.

The plans appear to propose casement windows and timber doors, and this should be confirmed (and would be appropriate). More details are required on the specifications for these given that this is part of the Conservation Area – for example, window proportions need to reflect the local vernacular as does the subdivision of glazing which currently is too busy and not well proportioned. If PVC window frames must be used, it is important that these have flush profile sections.

There are also too many blank facades, which need to be reconsidered to provide some relief. These are apparent in house types B, C/C2, K1/2 and L1/2. Whilst in some circumstances these are not particularly visible from the street scene, there are several locations where the blank façade will be clearly visible (eg Plots 4, 10, 11, 14, 19, 24, 26) – and this also relates to the earlier point on how the houses relate to the public spaces within the development.

Overall, whilst the current proposals have a reasonable degree of variation in building types, the overall impact is too monotonous in terms of materials and design features (appearing quite obviously as a single estate) and in this respect does not reflect the character of the village. Nor are the proposed plans particularly demonstrating innovative designs that might justify a different approach.

A final point on this matter is that there are no indications within the design of any photovoltaic panels on roofs. We would welcome confirmation that the Building Regulations requirements can be met without the need for these to be retrofitted (as retrofitting is less efficient and tends to be much more prominent). It may be appropriate to consider if garage roofs can be used, particularly where these are appropriately orientated and the panels would not be dominant in the street scene or wider views.

LANDSCAPING AND BIODIVERSITY

- d) The layout, scale and design, including landscaping requirements, will be required to minimise the visual impact of development as seen from the strip lynchets on Sutton Hill and provide an attractive entrance and edge to the village as seen from the approach along the A350. This should include a substantial landscaped edge along the south-west and south-east boundaries, and a pepper-potting of green landscaped spaces within the site. The design must enable the retention of the tree belt along the northern boundary

The Neighbourhood Plan noted that this site was highly visible as the southern entrance to village, and also partly visible from Sutton Hill and the strip lynchets in the AONB (although largely screened by the trees along the Hollow from Parsonage Street and seen in the context of the existing village).

The heritage statement does identify that “development has the potential to affect long views of Fontmell Magna from Sutton Hill and Fontmell Down and would also change the approach of the village from the south.” Its strategy in this respect is that: “Strategic planting would be placed within, and along the boundary of the proposed development to break up the built form and ensure the final development matches the rural character already apparent in long views. Planting is also planned along the southern, eastern and western boundaries of the study site, which together with the careful layout of the proposals, would avoid a hard, sub-urban edge, and would preserve the rural character of the CA when viewed from the approach along South Street.”

The site orientates itself so that the houses along the western boundary (adjoining the fields) back onto the countryside. The rear garden depth ranges from around 14m to 19m. This should provide sufficient depth to include not only the hedgerow proposed through the biodiversity plan, but also more generous landscaping on this edge (the policy does refer to a ‘substantial landscaped edge’, and it is disappointing that this is not shown clearly on the plans). It is hoped that this could be incorporated into the site layout and suitably conditioned. Further consideration should also be given to the set-back of the garage associated with plot 10, which reduces the gap to about 5m. There is room to bring forward the garage to enable better landscaping to the rear. It is also hampered by the fact that the site boundary in this location does not include the strip of land to the west, which would enable the turning area to perhaps be accommodated here, and a better solution worked out for plots 11 – 14 in relation to their parking requirements. Similarly, there is little in the way of landscaping shown for the south-western boundary where space is reserved for the future pumping station, and where it would make sense to provide landscaping to reduce the visual impact of this feature when it is needed, as it may otherwise be quite visible from the approach from the south.

The landscaping areas along the main road and also within the site are welcomed (subject to the caveats above in relation to how the housing relates to these spaces). It is important that the landscaping proposals are conditioned to ensure the planting allows for tree sizes that can mature to provide a significant contribution to the wider village-scape.

- e) The hedgerows are potentially important as wildlife corridors and a biodiversity appraisal together with a biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan will be required as stated in policy FM2 Local Wildlife Corridors and Protected Species.

A biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan has been provided with the application. This appears to include the retention of hedgerows as far as practical, together with protection and where appropriate replacement of the mature native trees on the site boundary. A wildlife corridor is also provided for along the northern boundary.

The decision to install either bird or bat boxes in every dwelling is broadly welcomed, but it would provide greater enhancement if both bird and bat boxes were installed in every dwelling.

It is not clear from the plans where the 3700m² species rich grassland is proposed – it would be useful to clarify if this is provided for as part of the open spaces within the site (suitably seeded and managed) as there are no clear plans showing the site areas. Nor is it clear who will be responsible for maintaining these features in the long term, and whilst a management company may well be set up (as suggested in the S106 heads of terms) some of the site boundary features may well form parts of individual properties.

FLOOD RISK

- f) A flood risk assessment must be undertaken as stated in Policy FM11 Sustainable Drainage.

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been undertaken by a transport planning consultancy, and it is not clear where it involved a suitably competent flood expert, which is a concern given the complex nature of the groundwater and surface water flood risk evidence in the area. The flood maps do show a degree of risk from groundwater flooding, and surface water flooding in the vicinity of the site (and local observations passed onto the Parish Council would suggest that the area is indeed susceptible to surface water flooding). It is noted that ground investigation works have not taken place given the Covid-19 restrictions. It is important that this work is carried out prior to finalising the designs.

In addition, Policy FM12 requires that any necessary upgrades to the sewage treatment works as advised by Wessex Water) will be in place prior to the site's occupation. This needs to be confirmed for this application.

HIGHWAYS, PEDESTRIAN LINKS AND PARKING

- g) A parking area for 20 cars for parents of school children should be provided in the area close to the site entrance off the A350, with a new footpath link to the School that avoids crossing roads. Provision must also be made in the northern corner of the site closest to the school for coach drop-off and collection.

The proposed plans show a parking area that can accommodate 19 spaces plus two coach-drop off locations. Whilst slightly below the Neighbourhood Plan requirements, this is considered to be a workable solution.

We note the intention to upgrade the footpath connecting to the school to an all-weather surface – as mentioned in the Transport Statement, and draft S106 agreement heads of terms (although this wrongly references the path as being to the north-west). This is a public right of way (although in multiple private ownerships) and therefore our understanding is that the highway authority should be able to undertake such work subject to securing the necessary costs. If there is a need to liaise on this point with the landowners (there are three), we would welcome this being done as we understand they have not been approached.

- h) Vehicular access will be provided via a new junction off the A350, designed in a manner appropriate to the Conservation Area and Rural Roads Protocol, and with the aim of reducing traffic speeds of all vehicles travelling in both directions along the A350 to under 30mph.

The plans show a right-hand turn lane in the south-bound direction on the main road as the proposed solution for this junction. A solid central island would be included to the north side to prevent overtaking. Whilst this is considered to be broadly acceptable, there are concerns about the safety of vehicles exiting the site and turning south and given the volume of traffic on the main road (which would appear to be a car every 5 seconds in both directions at peak times) and the fact that this flow will not be 'relieved' by cars waiting to turn into the site from the south-bound carriageway. We would welcome the highway's consideration of this point and if any further measures could be incorporated that might slow north-bound traffic at this point, as well as their confirmation that no street lighting should be necessary.

- i) The layout of the development should include a road and pedestrian access connecting to Land at Blandfords Farm Barn (as defined in Policy 20).

Whilst the plan includes a vehicular access up to the north-western edge of the site corner, due to the reduced site area it falls short of physically connecting to land at Blandfords Farm Barn. This connection is an important element of the policy to provide a more permeable network and access within the village, and it is important that this omission is rectified.

Dorset Planning Consultant Ltd

Director: Jo Witherden BSc(Hons) DipTP DipUD MRTPI
8 Orchard Rise, Milborne St Andrew, Dorset DT11 0LL
telephone: 01258 837092 --- mobile: 07983 562036



Registered in England – 10086020

email: jo@dorsetplanning.co.uk --- website: www.dorsetplanningconsultant.co.uk