



## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 23 April 2025

Site visit made on 23 April 2025

**by Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 May 2025

**Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/24/3351896**

**Land North of Ward's Drove, Blandford St Mary, DT11 9LZ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Hallam Land Management Ltd against the decision of Dorset Council.
- The application Ref is P/OUT/2024/01708.
- The development proposed is up to 130 dwellings, open space, landscaping (including LAP and LEAP), new vehicular and pedestrian access (including from the North Dorset Trailway), parking, engineering (including ground modelling and drainage) works and infrastructure (including cycle and pedestrian connections).

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for up to 130 dwellings, open space, landscaping (including LAP and LEAP), new vehicular and pedestrian access (including from the North Dorset Trailway), parking, engineering (including ground modelling and drainage) works and infrastructure (including cycle and pedestrian connections) at Land North of Ward's Drove, Blandford St Mary, DT11 9LZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/OUT/2024/01708, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

### Procedural Matters

2. The planning application was submitted in outline with all matters aside from access reserved. I assessed the appeal on that basis, treating the plans as illustrative aside from where they relate to the access arrangement.
3. The appeal is accompanied by a completed planning agreement (the S106) which seeks to provide obligations in relation to affordable housing, education, highway and transport improvements, Public Right of Way (PRoW) improvements, library provision, healthcare, community Infrastructure, allotments, public open space and the maintenance and management of such. This has led the Council to withdraw its third reason for refusal. Nonetheless I return to the matter of the planning obligations later in my decision.
4. During the appeal and following dialogue between the appellant and the Lead Local Flood Authority the Council also withdrew its fourth reason for refusal, which related to flood risk, on the basis that suitable flood risk details could be secured by planning conditions. I have no reason to disagree.

## Main Issues

5. Given the foregoing, the main issues are:

- the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with reference to landscape and visual effects, urban design, and the setting of the Cranborne Chase National Landscape (the CCNL); and
- the effect of the proposed development on the settings of the Grade II\* listed building Church of St Mary (the Church), the Grade II listed building The Old Rectory, and the Grade II listed building Clerkenwell House.

## Reasons

### *Background*

6. The appeal site comprises a roughly rectangular arable field, bound by trees and hedgerows, at the edge of the settlement of Blandford St Mary (BSM). It is within the settlement boundary for the village and effectively allocated for residential development under the terms of the Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan 2011 – 2033 (made 2021, modified 2023) (the B+NP). Whilst the B+NP does not quantify the number of houses that the appeal site can accommodate, it plans for a minimum of 1,700 homes to be delivered in the area over the plan period, a target which is around 100 homes off being met, if one takes extant permissions into account.
7. Directly to the northwest, the 'Bellway' development of 350 homes appears to be complete or nearing completion. A hedgerow forms the site's northeast boundary with the A350 Bournemouth Road, beyond which to the east is the hamlet of Lower Blandford St Mary (LBSM). To the north of this hamlet is the River Stour, the north valley slopes of which fall within the CCNL some 600m northeast of the site.
8. The Lane Wards Drove carries the PRoW E4/3, and together with a modest ribbon of development along it, defines the appeal site's southeast boundary. The North Dorset Trailway (the NDT) is a National Cycle Route and public way which largely follows the path of an old railway line, heads towards the site from the southeast, before diverting around it via Wards Drove and the A350. It is intended for the NDT to connect into the proposed development, and the illustrative plans show that it would traverse the scheme and connect into the Bellway site.

### *Character and appearance*

9. The site is in the Open Chalk Downland Landscape Character Area. Key characteristics of this area that would be harmed by the development are the openness of the site, and the front hedgerow facing onto the A350 owing to its translocation and reduction to provide access. The level of impact would not be significant, given the proximity of the appeal site to the densely suburban Bellway scheme. It is also relevant that development of the site is anticipated through its effective allocation, and there is an absence of credible evidence that it would be feasible for the site access to be taken from elsewhere or to a different design.
10. Policy B10 of the B+NP requires decision makers to have full regard to the Blandford+ Design Guidance and Codes document (the coding document). The coding document establishes character areas in the neighbourhood plan area, then introduces general design coding and guidance, and then character area specific design coding and guidance. The site is within CA9 Countryside of Blandford St

Mary, which is noted amongst other things for its arable landscape and limited settlement. However, by my reading, the descriptions of each character area do not establish a standard to be adhered in and of themselves, rather it is the guidance and coding which should be applied to each development proposal. The language of Policy B10 and the coding document is also such that that the coding document must not be interpreted as strict doctrine, but rather with discretion.

11. Code 1 of the coding document states that schemes should seek to maintain the density and scale of development within its context (not I note, only the specific character area it is within), and respect the historic, landscape and other key features of the 'Neighbourhood Area' (which means the entire neighbourhood plan area). Code 2 states that schemes should be considered strategically at the settlement level and not in isolation. Development should strive to knit in with the existing settlement morphology by adopting similar characteristics.
12. The appeal scheme's design concept adheres to this clear steer by correctly identifying the need to assimilate with the Bellway development whilst providing a graduation to the countryside. This is achieved by landscaping and a subtle but important increase in density away from the A350 and Wards Drove towards the Bellway site. Another key concept is to reduce the prominence of the scheme by holding buildings to no more than two storeys in height. Code 11 would therefore also be adhered to, insofar as it states that the massing of buildings should be sensitive to the surrounding rural landscape.
13. The Council has undertaken an exercise which indicates that the illustrative housing density per hectare is slightly higher than that stated, and at the west end slightly higher than the Bellway site. To focus on arbitrary differences in illustrated density in this way is not hugely useful, as it fails to grasp the design concept. The National Design Guide informs us that well-designed places come about when there is a clearly expressed 'story' for the design, which I consider applies here.
14. Regarding the adequacy of the transition the scheme would provide to the countryside, there is an important context here in that the Bellway site provides next to none; it has an abrupt, harsh edge to the appeal site which feels unresolved. The lower density housing closest to Wards Drove would be screened by comparatively greater existing and proposed planting. Wards Drove would adequately retain its rural character, albeit it would come to form a new rural edge. Where views would be most direct towards the site, when traveling towards it along the NDT, the landscape buffer would be at its deepest and most significant.
15. It is put to me that the existing site acts as a buffer to Bellway and that the scheme would bring a more prominent form of development closer to Wards Drove and the NDT. However, the edge of the Bellway site, compounded by its elevated position and the three-storey scale of some of its buildings, is prominent and incongruous regardless of its position beyond the appeal site. Ultimately, whilst the proposal would extend BSM further to the southeast, the scheme would markedly improve the interface between the settlement and the countryside.
16. The proposal would bring BSM closer to LBSM. However, the physical coalescence of the two settlements would not occur owing to the adequate landscape buffer that would be located at the east end of the appeal site. From Viewpoint 5<sup>1</sup> along the NDT much of the housing would be screened by buildings and greenery along

---

<sup>1</sup> Within the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2024)

Wards Drove, in addition to the proposed landscape buffer in the site. The A350 is also a significant separating feature. In the immediate environs of the proposed development, individual settlement legibility would therefore be retained.

17. Further afield the site reads as part of a gap between LBSM and BSM at Viewpoint 9 across the River Stour<sup>2</sup>. Even so, the Bellway site looms large over LBSM from here, and the prominent mass of housing fronting the Bellway site visually bridges the gap between the two settlements. The appeal site, where it is closest to LBSM, is screened by greenery, with the upper, more visible part of the site more marginal to LBSM. This, together with suitable tree planting along the proposed extension to the NDT bisecting the site, would break up the visual presence of the built form within the scheme significantly. It was clarified at the Hearing that the route of the NDT through the appeal site could avoid existing powerlines (if they remain) to ensure that taller tree planting could be accommodated along its length.
18. In any event, the issue of coalescence is not just about physical proximity; rather it also goes to one's sense of place. LBSM is highly screened from the A350 to the extent that, if it were not for road signs, the casual observer may be forgiven for not knowing it is there. It is an introverted and tranquil place which contrasts significantly with the higher density, planned suburban housing which largely characterises its bigger and more vibrant neighbour. This significant distinction in the sense of place between BSM and LBSM would be preserved by the scheme, given that it would look more to Bellway and BSM in its general design approach.
19. Indeed, to attempt to adopt or reflect the density, arrangement and/or character of LBSM, and even that of Wards Drove, as has been suggested, would be less appropriate in my view, as it would be liable to conflate BSM and LBSM as two different settlements. In this sense, I do not consider the appeal site to be a location where it would be beneficial to follow the recommendation of CA9 Code 10, where it states that housing should be formed in larger plots with generous front and back gardens that back onto the surrounding countryside and open fields.
20. As for street trees, I have found that taller trees along the new length of the NDT would be sufficient to settle the development in wider landscape and visual terms, and so tall street trees are not essential to also serve this purpose. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires new streets to be tree-lined but does not quantify to what extent. The illustrative masterplan shows that all streets within the development would feature trees to a greater or lesser degree.
21. There is concern about a reduction in the number of the shown trees due to street lighting being added to the detailed scheme. However, given that there is a clear justification for the minimisation of street lighting within this sensitive landscape context, adequate street tree planting could be accommodated in the development. It is worth adding that when it comes to tree-lined streets, the Framework puts an onus on collaboration, stating that developers and officers should work together to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of users. This type of collaboration lends itself to the detailed design phase, not illustrative drawings.
22. I have no reason to doubt that outward views to the CCNL could be designed into the scheme. Whilst I recognise concerns as to the aesthetic merits of the illustrated drainage system, the coding document makes clear that there are additional

---

<sup>2</sup> Along the footpath E13/1

techniques to ensure that drainage is satisfactorily integrated, including permeable paving, rainwater harvesting, and infiltration within green corridors. On this basis, this is also a matter that could be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

23. Not every property on the masterplan with parking to the side would have the 3m minimum front garden depth promoted by Code 6. At the Hearing it was expressed that the reserved matters stage allowed for certain elements of the design to be readdressed through tweaks in other areas, for example by reducing back-to-back differences between the housing. To me this is reflective of the discretionary approach espoused by Policy B10 and the associated coding document, and the greater suitability for those detailed design issues to be addressed within the reserved matters submissions. In principle therefore, I am satisfied that the illustrative masterplan and the design concept it conveys have been created having full regard to the coding document. This leads me to the conclusion that, in design terms, a scheme for 130 dwellings can be adequately accommodated on the site.
24. As for the setting of the CCNL, National Landscapes have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty and great weight is to be afforded to conserving and enhancing their landscape and scenic beauty. I am aware that as the decision maker here I must seek to further the purpose for which the CCNL is designated: to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area. These requirements extend to the setting of the CCNL including the appeal site.
25. Landscape views out of the CCNL are important<sup>3</sup>. However, for the reasons already expressed, the site has a minimal role in outward views from around Viewpoint 9, and its development as suggested would not harm the landscape and scenic beauty of the CCNL. The same goes for Viewpoint 10 deeper into the CCNL.
26. At my site visit I waited for night to fall. This enabled me to observe that, in terms of light pollution, and with onsite street lighting minimised so far as possible, the development would appear modest within the context of the established lights and the overall glow of Blandford Forum, BSM and now the Bellway development. For this reason, the proposal would do little to challenge the dark skies of the CCNL.
27. As for furthering the purpose of the CCNL, I am mindful that the site was found to be one of the least sensitive in landscape terms in the neighbourhood plan area<sup>4</sup>, which is even more so the case today following the build out of the Bellway development. It is logical to conclude that, if the NDP's minimum housing requirement is not met here, other sites will come forward which could harm the setting and thus the purpose of the CCNL. Delivering needed housing in a location found to be one of the most appropriate to do so within the setting of the CCNL will minimise the effects of housing delivery in the area, and thus further the CCNL's purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area.
28. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, with reference to landscape and visual effects, urban design, and the setting of the CCNL. In these respects it would accord with the landscape and design objectives of Policy B10 of the B+NP, Policies 4 and 24 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (adopted 2016) (NDLP), the Framework and the National Design Guide.

---

<sup>3</sup> As set out in the Cranborne Chase AONB Management Plan

<sup>4</sup> As Assessment Area E in the Strategic Landscape and Heritage Study for the North Dorset Area (2019)

### *Listed buildings*

29. LBSM features numerous listed buildings, the settings of three of which are the focus of this particular area of dispute between the main parties: the Church, The Old Rectory, and Clerkenwell House. I am mindful of my duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving each of their settings. The Framework also states that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
30. Clerkenwell House was once a farmhouse and so in a general sense its significance is in part informed by its agrarian setting. There is, however, no clear evidence that it had any direct association with the appeal site as farmland, and so to try and draw a compelling link between the two in this respect is unduly speculative. There is also extremely limited intervisibility between the site and the listed building, with the busy and noisy A350 a significant disruptive influence between the two. As such, the site makes a neutral contribution to the significance of Clerkenwell House, and the proposed development would preserve its setting.
31. There is, however, evidence linking the appeal site to the Church and The Old Rectory as former glebe land. You would not know that to look at the site, the documentary evidence would still exist after the development, and the very same physical constraints dissociate the site from these listed buildings in much the same way as Clerkenwell House. Moreover, the site does not retain its historic internal subdivisions, and other areas of the historic glebe, such as the open field to the southeast, have a much more direct visual connection with the Church.
32. The Council is concerned about relying on intervening vegetation as screening, particularly as it is subject to seasonal differences and as there is Ash present, which is subject to disease. However, in my view the level of vegetation between LBSM and the appeal site is so established, significant, dense and multi layered, that it can be relied upon. Given such, whilst the appeal site makes a modest contribution to the significance of both The Old Rectory and the Church as former glebe land, the scheme would preserve each of their settings in this respect.
33. The Church's most important setting relationship is with the tranquil and picturesque farming landscape to the northeast, of which there are open views. Views of the tower set against the Stour Valley to the north are also important. In contrast, the countryside to the west has been punctuated by imposed change. This includes the widening and/or introduction of what is now the A350, the coming of the (now departed) railway, the realignment of Wards Drove to allow for such, the newer buildings on Wards Drove, solar farm development and the modern expansion of BSM, which has continued apace with the Bellway development.
34. That said, the church tower elevates its visibility in the landscape, and so views of the Church from the A350, and from the NDT, particularly from around Viewpoint 5 and a nearby bench, warrant further analysis. From the A350 the Church appears fleetingly and framed by surrounding buildings and vegetation and so there is limited ability to understand the significance of the Church in its setting. If you have noticed it at all, you do not read it as overtly rural, or as the nucleus of an historic hamlet. Given the proposed landscape buffers, the illustrated housing arrangement would not have been readily appreciable until one has passed the Church going into BSM, or rather before one has knowingly left BSM in the other direction.

35. When sat on the bench it is surprising how much ribbon development fills the view, including the buildings on Wards Drove and housing along the A350 to the southeast. The Bellway site is highly prominent, and the Church appears against the built backdrop of Blandford Forum. The noise and movement of the A350 challenges one's sense of rural tranquillity. The appeal site is well hidden by the hedgerow directly before you, and the greenery and buildings on Wards Drove. This all makes the bench a poor place from which understand the Church's rural setting, and it also means that the proposal would do little to alter that.
36. The latter greenery and built form aside Wards Drove, together with new planting, would further be instrumental in significantly lowering the visual presence of the proposed development from around Viewpoint 5. These features would simply screen much of the housing at the point where it would encroach closest to the Church. The upper west slope of the site is more open to view as you walk towards it, but the closer you get, the more the Church becomes peripheral to one's vision, to the point where it becomes highly oblique. Given such, the proposal would preserve the setting of the Church as experienced along the NDT.
37. Within the appeal site the tower is visible and set against the verdant backdrop of the CCNL. However, these views could be retained and even designed into the scheme, with a greater number of people able to enjoy the Church from this location. Across the valley at Viewpoint 9 I struggled for a while to even identify the Church even though I was there for the specific purpose of viewing it. The tower is not a striking landmark here and, shrouded by vegetation, it does little to signal the presence of the Church or LBSM. For these reasons and those already rehearsed, the scheme would not harmfully change the setting of the Church from this location.
38. The three listed buildings have a degree of group value in forming the nucleus of LBSM, and for obvious reasons the Church and The Old Rectory have an intrinsic relationship. This contributes to each of their significance. For the reasons already articulated throughout this decision letter, the group value of the listed buildings would not be harmed by the introduction of the development into their settings.
39. Accordingly, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the settings of the Church, The Old Rectory, and Clerkenwell House. It would therefore accord with the heritage aims of Policy 5 of the NDLP and the Framework.

### **Other Matters**

40. The site is further within the settings of several other Grade II listed buildings comprising monuments in the churchyard<sup>5</sup> and the Grade II\* Manor House at the edge of LBSM. I must also have special regard to the desirability of preserving each of their settings. None of the monuments have intervisibility with the appeal site, and the significance they derive from their settings is drawn from the relationship to the church and the churchyard. The proposals would not therefore harm the significance these assets take from their respective settings.
41. The 17th century Manor House derives its heritage significance from a combination of aesthetic and historical values. Elements of its setting that contribute to its significance include its historical outbuildings, grounds, and looking wider its historic landholding. The appeal site was not part of its historic landholding, and due to intervening buildings and vegetation, the proposal would not harm its setting.

---

<sup>5</sup> Dale Monument, Brine Monument, Elizabeth Jones Monument, Wheller Family Monument

42. Wards Drove is likely an historic drover's road, and I have no reason to divert from the B+NP monitoring group's assessment of it as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). However, it has equally been the scene of change and itself has become more developed. The Bellway site looms over its setting and it was realigned to provide the bridge over the former railway. What is left of its original route would be unchanged. For these reasons, Wards Drove as a NDHA would not be harmed.
43. I acknowledge the concern about the impact of the proposal on local services. However, it is not the role of the development to alleviate existing issues or the effects of other developments, but rather to ensure that its own effects would be adequately mitigated. The consultees responsible for these facilities are satisfied that this would be achieved in this case. I have no compelling reason to disagree.
44. The site could wholly constitute Grade 3a farmland, which falls within the definition of the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. Given that the site is effectively allocated for development, the agricultural purpose of the site is likely to be lost in any event. With regard to the accessibility of the site to local services, the same point holds true; people are likely going to live here. As for highways safety, the expert opinion before me is that the access would be designed to an appropriate standard with adequate visibility. There is no compelling evidence that, following the development, the residual impact upon the highway network would be severe.
45. Whilst badger and dormouse are present within the vegetation around the site, and bats have been recorded using this habitat as movement corridors and for foraging, the expert opinion set out in the evidence is that the conservation status of these protected species can be ensured through the retention and careful management of the habitat where possible, and the introduction of new habitat including green corridors, to be secured by conditions. There are no grounds before me to divert from that expert opinion.

### **Planning Obligations**

46. The S106 would provide a policy compliant quantum of 30% affordable housing. A contribution to local healthcare is required to offset the greater demand that would be created. Likewise, contributions are needed towards pre, primary and secondary school provision. A contribution to special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) provision is also necessary. Blandford Forum has a library, and a sum is required to support the additional footfall that the library would receive.
47. On site play and open spaces, the maintenance arrangements of such, in addition to commuted sums toward offsite community facilities would ensure accordance with Policies 14 and 15 of the NDLP insofar as they would ensure the adequate maintenance of social and green infrastructure. Likewise, a sum shall support additional allotments in BSM to cater for the increased population.
48. A commuted sum will support the upgrading of footpaths connecting the site to BSM's primary school and a contribution is also necessary to be made to sustainable transport. Due to the increased footfall, contributions are required to upgrade the surrounding PRoW network and explore the potential for an extension to the network. Given the desire to connect the NDT through the site, and the mitigatory landscaping that the new route of the NDT within the site would provide, it is necessary for the S106 to secure connection points for this extended route. All in all, for these reasons, the S106 complies with Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 122, and I can take it into account in my decision.

## Conditions

49. A condition is required to ensure that applications for the reserved matters are made within three years, and conversely that the development does not commence until all reserved matters are agreed, but must do so within two years of that point. To guide the detailed design response, a condition is needed to provide compliance with the fixed plans that accompany this appeal. In the interest of highway safety, conditions are required to ensure that the access, including its visibility splays, is laid out and maintained to the necessary standards. In the interest of sustainable transport, details of cycle provision within the scheme are needed.
50. In the interest of the living conditions of residents and of highway safety, a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be agreed with the Council prior to construction beginning. A further document shall also allow for the suitable management of the construction phase with regard to biodiversity. It is necessary for a condition to ensure the adequate protection of trees within influence of the proposal including those subject to Tree Preservation Orders. Conditions will secure the detailed drainage strategy for the site, for during and post construction, and the maintenance arrangements for such.
51. In the interest of sustainable transport, a condition shall require agreement with the Council of a Travel Plan for the development. To ensure the development is adequately assimilated into its environment with respect to the character and appearance of the area and in the interest of ecology going forward, a Landscape Strategy and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan shall be agreed with the Council. Similarly, conditions are needed to maintain a maximum height for buildings on the site, and the appropriateness of any external lighting. Lastly, a condition is required to manage the landscaping within the land shown on the site location plan to be beyond the appeal site, but within the appellant's control.

## Conclusion

52. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

*Matthew Jones*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Zack Simons KC	Counsel, instructed by Hallam Land Management Ltd
Francesca Parmenter	Planning Specialist
Andy Williams	Urban Design Specialist
Gary Holliday	Landscape Specialist
Dr Chris Miele	Heritage Specialist
James Stacey	Affordable Housing Specialist
Liam Webster	Affordable Housing Specialist

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Robert Lennis	Lead Project Officer
Katherine Van Etten	Senior Landscape Architect
Sophie Smith	Senior Urban Design Officer
Tobias Carleton-Prangnell	Senior Conservation Officer
Philip Reese	Senior Planning Policy Officer

### INTERESTED PARTIES

Rupert Hardy	Campaign for the Protection of Rural England
--------------	--

### DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING OR AFTER THE HEARING

1. Local housing delivery update
2. Map of viewpoints
3. Completed planning agreement

## Schedule of Conditions

- 1) Approval of the details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (hereafter the reserved matters) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved reserved matter details.
- 2) Application for the approval of any reserved matter must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 3) The development hereby permitted it shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: HLM053 – 008 Rev B, HLM053 - 034 Rev B, 19102\_001 P12.
- 4) Notwithstanding the information shown on the approved plans, prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved precise details of the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 5) Prior to commencement of any works on site (other than those required by this condition), the first 15.00m of the access road, including the junction with the existing public highway, shall be completed to at least binder course level.
- 6) Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, the visibility splay areas as shown on Drawing Number 19102\_001 P12 must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.60 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. The splay areas must thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstructions.
- 7) Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, a scheme showing precise details of the proposed cycle parking facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme must be constructed prior to the occupation of each dwelling and, thereafter, must be retained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.
- 8) Prior to commencement of the development, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CTMP must include:
  - construction vehicle details;
  - a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries;
  - timings of deliveries so as to avoid, where possible, peak traffic periods;
  - compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage arrangements;
  - wheel and vehicle cleaning facilities;
  - details of the inspection of the highways serving the site;
  - a scheme of appropriate signing of vehicle routes to the site;
  - a route plan for all contractors and suppliers.

The development must be carried out in accordance with the approved CTMP.

9) Prior to the commencement of any works on site, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP must include the following:

- risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities;
- identification of "biodiversity protection zones";
- practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements);
- the location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity;
- the times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;
- responsible persons and lines of communication;
- the responsibilities on site of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) or similarly competent person;
- use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs;
- pollution prevention measures with particular regard to surface water.

The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved CEMP.

10) Prior to commencement of any works on site, a scheme for protecting trees, based on the measures outlined in the Arboricultural Assessment (dated March 2024) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be carried out in full prior to commencement of the development hereby approved.

11) Prior to the commencement of any works on site a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and providing clarification of how drainage is to be managed during construction, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted details.

12) Prior to the commencement of any works on site details of the maintenance and management of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter 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.

13) Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It shall include provision to:

- promote sustainable transport modes for accessing the site;
- reduce the numbers of trips generated by private motor vehicles;
- improve air quality through the reduction of carbon emissions and other pollutants; and

- promote healthier and more active lifestyles to residents including the arrangements for the appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator.

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the approved Travel Plan has been implemented. Within 6 calendar months of the 50% occupation of the development, a baseline travel survey shall be carried out and the results submitted to the Local Planning Authority in an updated version of the Travel Plan. Thereafter on an annual basis for a period of 5 years a monitoring travel survey shall be carried out and submitted to the Local Planning Authority in a monitoring report. The survey shall confirm whether or not the objectives of the Travel Plan have been achieved and shall contain, where necessary, recommendations for amendments or improvements to the Travel Plan.

- 14) As part of the relevant reserved matter, a Site Wide Landscape Strategy (SWLS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The SWLS should be prepared in accordance with the approved Parameter Plan (ref. HLM053 – 034 Rev B) and have regard to the Indicative Landscape Proposals and Mitigation Plan (ref. 8554 – L-01 Rev D) and will include a Landscape Parameter Plan that identifies the following components:

- retained trees and hedgerows to be enhanced and accommodated within identified landscape corridors;
- areas of soft landscape and proposals for their protection during construction and replacement where relevant;
- the location of the North Dorset Trailway route to connect between the northwestern and southeastern boundaries. This route to be led through a green corridor with native tree and shrub planting; and
- planting plans and schedule of plants.

The SWLS should have regard to the findings of the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (K/8554/LANDS/LVA/8554 LVA REPORT) with particular reference to:

- the treatment of the frontage to the A350 to accommodate SUDS set within native planting and habitat creation;
- the provision of landscape corridors to provide green 'buffers' along site boundaries, particularly along the southeastern boundary with Wards Drove;
- the provision of tree planting within the development area.

The SWLP must be implemented in accordance with the approved details. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

- 15) Prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby approved, a Landscape and Ecological Management plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP shall have regard to the

submitted Ecological Impact Assessment Update (EIAU) dated July 2024 and include:

- description and evaluation of features to be managed;
- ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
- aims and objectives of management;
- appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
- preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period)
- details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan;
- ongoing monitoring and remedial measures. Amongst other relevant measures, it shall specify that any trees or other plants, if within a period of five years from the date of the development being completed, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, be replaced during the next planting season with other trees or plants of a species and size to be first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and that soft landscape features must be maintained for the lifetime of the scheme.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery.

The LEMP shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved LEMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

- 16) The dwellings hereby permitted shall not exceed 2 storeys nor 9.5 metres in height.
- 17) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved. A lux contour lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting scheme should meet the target Lux levels on the habitat features described in the EIAU, to ensure the features described remain accessible to light sensitive bats. External lighting shall be installed in accordance with the lighting scheme and thereafter retained.
- 18) No development hereby permitted shall take place until a planting scheme on the land edged blue on approved plan Application Site Boundary Plan (HLM053 – 008 Rev B) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved planting scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season following the commencement of development, and thereafter retained. For a period of five years from the carrying out of the approved planting scheme, the planting shall be protected and maintained, and any planting that is found to be dead, dying or diseased during that period shall be replaced by planting of a similar size and species (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA) in the first planting season following notice of such occurrence.