

The Comments raised by Charlton Marshall Parish Council re Planning Application 2/2012/1292/PLNG

The reports have been read and various issues have arisen as follows:

- Page 3** **Design and Access Statement**
Site Description
re "...the site is adjoined by established dwellings on three sides"
comment The site is adjoined on two sides – the northwest side is bordered by Church Lane, not by the properties in Cereleton Park – definition is incorrect.
The properties surrounding the site are bungalows, even those bordering onto Church Lane in Cereleton Park.
re "...former Poole to Blandford Forum railway line, now used as a Trailway for"
comment Infers the trailway runs from Poole to Blandford Forum – is only from Spetisbury to Blandford St Mary.
re "There are no other access points to adjoining land"
comment Charlton Mead is an access point of entry now. Also an historic private access via a tunnel under the Trailway from Gulliver House.
re- "Bus Services to Blandford Forum and Poole/Bournemouth..."
comment This is a limited daily service, starting around 8.00am to Blandford until 7.00pm from Poole. Two later buses are available on a Friday night. On Sundays only 4 buses during the day on a 2 hourly schedule.
- Page 7** **Design**
Page 8 **Design Proposals**
comment This is an eclectic mix of buildings - the new design leaves much to be desired. It is still considered to more of an urban design with high density. It has an unnecessary landmark building which is overbearing and out of keeping with the rest of the development. It will be visible from Church Lane, the Trailway and properties bordering Church Lane in Cereleton Park.
- comment** **Description of the Proposal**
Church Lane hedge – at the present time walkers in Church Lane have open views into the site through the hedge – if the site is developed it will be into residents' gardens, a loss of privacy for owners. There is no mention as to whether the owners will be allowed to erect fencing and if so what height it might be. This will be a loss of visual amenity.
No provision has been made for any hedging/screening on the border of the site for residents in The Close, a loss of privacy amenity.
The pedestrian access into Church Lane – no provision has been made for safety onto the road.
Staggered safety barriers needed.
The mix of roofing materials and colours of the properties is not in keeping with the conservation area.
The three story building is overbearing and out of keeping. It will have a visual impact on Church Lane and Cereleton Park residents bordering Church Lane.
The reinforced road surfaces by variation are not typical of the village, this is an urban design.
condition **The design, if permission is granted, has to remain as the status quo, no room for alterations.**
Any temporary access road that is built into the site allowing access for residents living in Church Lane to exit the area while work is being carried out in Church Lane to be removed completely by the end of the development.
- Page 12** **Access**
comment Concerns regarding the level of traffic movements via The Close, properties above the bridge in The Close, Hopegood Close and Charlton Mead. The properties above the bridge in The Close have not been taken into account.
- Page 13** **Appendix**
CABE tick list
comment Have reservations on a number of points as there isn't any evidence to support them.
- Page 14** **Lighting**
comment Apart from one light at the entry to Church Lane from the A350 and Cereleton Park, which is not in the conservation area, there is no lighting in any other part of the village. Therefore this should set precedence for any development.

Planning Statement

2 Planning Policy

2.1 Government Guidance

comment The village is not sustainable as it has limited community amenities.
No identified need for housing of any type in the village. Business opportunities limited.

2.2 North Dorset District-Wide Local Plan

Policy 1.1 Sustainable Development

comment There is no evidence housing is needed in the village.
At one of the former planning applications the Chairman, at that time, of the planning committee made the comment 'The settlement boundary had been lazily drawn as the field should never have been included', with which the village agrees.
A revised SHLAA should have been done as part of the AMR.

Policy 1.4 Village Development

comment Charlton Marshall is, sadly, no longer a viable and sustainable rural community. It was viable before Cereleton Park, Oakcrest, Tannery Court and Parva Cottages were built, and when there was a shop, petrol station and Post Office. It is now a village with a high population but without facilities.

Policy 1.8 Standards Assessment Criteria

comment Non-conformity against the criteria.

Policy 1.19 Lighting

comment States in development response - ...their relationship with neighbouring areas and properties..
Non-conformity of the detrimental effect on unlit rural areas. The immediate neighbouring areas do not have street lighting – this would be out of keeping with the area. Apart from Cereleton Park no lighting in the village.

Policy 1.24 Character of Conservation Area

comment This statement is not applicable to this site as it is too contradictory.

Policy 1.40 Landscaping of New Development

comment It was understood from NDDC tree officer at the previous applications a number of trees had a 'limited life' or could be removed at no detriment to the area. This view has now changed and more trees are being preserved – but who will be responsible for the long term maintenance and care of those with a 'limited life' and replacement replanting in the public areas on the site? This also includes the hedges and greens.

Policy 2.10 Density of the Development

comment The density of the development is overbearing and dense in comparison to the surrounding areas.

Policy 5.17 Parking Standards

comment These standards are not applicable to rural areas, especially if they are not sustainable rural communities with no local facilities or employment to meet basic day to day needs.

2.3 The New Plan for North Dorset

Core Policy 1 Climate Change

comment No evidence to back this statement

Core Policy 3 Core Spatial Strategy for North Dorset

comment This has been challenged – Charlton Marshall is not sustainable as it cannot perform the function of a local services centre. The route along the A350 to Blandford was deemed as 'too dangerous' by DCC for children to walk or cycle to school.

Core Policy 4 Housing (including Affordable) Distribution

comment This is contradictory to the New Core Plan.

Core Policy 8 Housing Mix, Type & Density

comment This development is not meeting the required criteria for either affordable or private.

Core Policy 9 Affordable Housing

comment The affordable housing has not been 'pepper potted' around the site. The layout of the site

has isolated the affordable housing at the far end of the cul-de-sac where it is not possible for integration.

Core Policy 19 Stalbridge and Larger Villages

comment This is in question due to the emerging New Plan.

DMP Policy 1 Renewable Energy

comment There is no evidence to support the statement.

DMP Policy 3 Design

comment This has been highlighted at previous points in Design & Access.

DMP Policy 9 Trees, Hedgerows and landscape Design

This has been highlighted at previous point – policy 1.40

2.4 Interim Position Statement on Housing and Land Supply

comment There is a lack of information due to the current position of being in between policies. From the original plan there is a fundamental change in the provision for housing in the village. The time frame for the new policy to be adopted is still some months away which is not in the village's favour on this particular occasion.

2.6 SHLAA

comment As referred to in Policy 1.1, this should have been revised as part of the AMR.

3 Principle of Development

3.1 Location of New Housing

comment As referred to in Policy 2.6 and core Policy 3.

It is set out in the Section 106 agreement “on-site provision of affordable housing” as one of the benefits – there is no evidence offered to back up this statement. Local Policy 1.4 is not satisfied.

3.2 Housing Supply

comment As between policies the categorisation of the village is still an issue. In the New Plan sustainability and new housing allocation is vastly different to the current plan.

3.3 Residential Use

comment The development is not adjoined by three sides by established residential areas. Is still stating “the development would effectively complete the Cereleton Park development.....etc.” Cereleton Park is not connected and is not in a conservation area.

3.4 Loss of Open Space

comment The public views from the Trailway are far reaching across the valley beyond Charlton Manor for at least 6 months of the year, as are the views into the site from Church Lane.

3.5 Section 106 Agreement

comment Affordable housing – no evidence to back this

condition Financial contribution – to be paid in a lump sum, not in stages

Provision of highway enhancements – this was not discussed with the Parish Council at any of the meetings so should not be included in the 106

Allotments – This should be with no time scale of use, with water supplied, not the putting the costs on to the Parish Council

Trailway – pedestrian/cycle link – why is this not on the development side. If the tunnel is used who will be responsible for the maintenance of the link and the tunnel. Has anyone thought about the dangers of using this at night – unlit!

Drainage and Services

Issues regarding the draining away of heavy rainfall is a real concern in both The Close and Church Lane.

Transport

Our concerns have been raised from the Design & Access Statement - page 12.

Bus service – is adequate, with no late night service other than Friday

Railway stations – as the nearest is in Poole, another form of transport is required to get there

If the development goes ahead The Close will have to manage traffic from 77 properties. As highway enhancement has been included, does this not mean a problem has been foreseen and this is the “solution”! It is not easy now to exit right onto the A350 to Poole, it will be

inevitable an increase in accidents will occur.

Parking on site – this is not realistic as most residents do not use their garage as a parking space. Living in a rural area with limited public transport services, most families have at least two vehicles which will lead to more on road parking or use of visitor spaces.

The car-port parking under the flat will not be pleasant for the occupants above, noise and fumes will be an issue.

Community Involvement

The public consultation was well attended as this will have a big impact on the community.

Conclusion

Because of the Interim between Policies the Council cannot give a positive comment regarding certain issues as the applicant, who has picked out points to suit their needs.

According to the Draft New Plan there is no need currently for any new houses.

The village is not a sustainable community as it has no opportunities for employment or basic facilities to meet everyday needs.

The Close – This is a difficult road at the present time, adding more vehicles will only compound the issue. On the conservation side of the road the residents have no other option but to park on the road, which restricts visibility of pedestrians, adding to the problem.

The overall visual and physical density is too high.

The Affordable housing not being integrated throughout the site is a concern, as they are isolated into the far corner of the cul-de-sac.

If this application had been submitted after the New Plan had been adopted it would not be considered. Therefore the village has been put at an unfair disadvantage.