



**Dorchester Town Council**

Council Offices, 19 North Square, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 1JF  
Telephone: (01305) 266861

**For information about this agenda contact Georgina Wakely  
g.wakely@dorchester-tc.gov.uk**

25 March 2020

**Agenda for the meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee** which will be held in the **Council Chamber, Municipal Buildings, Dorchester** on **30 March 2020 at 7.00pm.**

Adrian Stuart  
Town Clerk

**Public Speaking at the Meeting**

The Chairman has discretion to allow members of the public to speak at the meeting. If you wish to address the Committee, please contact the Committee Clerk at least one day in advance of the meeting. We ask speakers to confine their comments to the matter in hand and to be as brief as is reasonably possible.

**Member Code of Conduct: Declaration of Interests**

Members are reminded that it is their responsibility to disclose pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests where appropriate. A Member who declares a pecuniary interest must leave the room unless a suitable dispensation has been granted. A Member who declares a non-pecuniary interest may take part in the meeting and vote.

**Membership of the Committee**

Councillors R. Biggs (the Mayor ex-officio), A. Canning, L. Fry, T. Harries (Vice- Chairman), J. Hewitt, S. Hosford, G. Jones, S. Jones, F. Kent-Ledger, R. Major, R. Potter (Chairman), M. Rennie and R. Ricardo

**1. Apologies and Declarations of Interest**

It is recommended that twin hatted Councillors make a statement regarding their participation in the consideration of planning applications at this agenda item.

**2. Minutes**

To confirm and sign the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 2 March 2020.

**3. Request for Parking Restrictions**

To consider a request from the Dorset Council to support a single line timed restriction, weekdays only, joining up the two bus bays along Coburg Road (Map and request attached).

**4. Dorset Local Plan Development**

To consider the attached draft response from Dorchester Town Council to the Dorset Council's preliminary questions regarding the development of a new Local Plan (attached) and to make any

recommendations of additional content.

5. [WD/D/19/002470 37 - 38 High West Street, Dorchester, DT1 1UP](#)

To note Heritage England's additional response and the Design and Conservation Officer's response to the above planning application (attached in a separate document) and to consider if a revised comment to the planning application is required.

6. **Planning Applications for Comment**

To receive and comment on the planning applications received from Dorset Council (attached appendix 1).

7. **Minute Update Report**

To receive and consider the minute updates reported.

8. **Planning Issues to Note**

To note any planning related issues including decisions made by Dorset Council on planning applications (contrary to Dorchester Town Council's comments), withdrawn applications and others (attached).

**Dorchester Town Council**  
**Planning and Environment Committee**

**2 March 2020**

Present: The Mayor, Councillor R Biggs and Councillors A. Canning, L. Fry, J. Hewitt, G. Jones, S. Jones, F. Kent-Ledger, R. Major, R. Potter (Chairman), M. Rennie and R. Ricardo.

Apologies: Councillors. S. Hosford and T. Harries

Also in attendance: Councillors A. Chisholm, F. Hogwood and D. Leaper

David Aldwinckle (Magna Housing Property Director), Louise Davidson (Magna Housing Property Manager) and Corinne Holbrook (Dorset Council Community Highways Officer).

**74. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Fry stated that as a member of Dorset Council's Area Planning Committee, he would keep an open mind on the planning applications and consider all information available at each stage of the decision process. He would take part in the debate but not vote on planning applications at this meeting.

Councillor R. Biggs declared a non pecuniary interest in planning application WD/D/20/000301 31 St Helens Road, DORCHESTER, DT1 1SD and stated that he would not take part in any debate on this application.

**75. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3 February 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**76. WD/D/19/002366 Land and Garages Rear of 13-19 Eddison Avenue, Dorchester – Update**

The Committee had previously considered application WD/D/19/002366 Land and Garages Rear of 13-19 Eddison Avenue, Dorchester at the Planning and Environment Committee meeting held on 4 November 2019. The Committee had in principle supported the development of the site, however, the Committee had recommended refusal of the proposed application due to concerns that the height of the proposed properties would be overbearing and detrimental to the amenity of the neighbour and the effect of the loss of parking for nearby residents would lead to displacement of vehicles into surrounding roads. The Committee had requested that representatives from Magna Housing be invited to attend a future Planning and Environment Committee meeting to discuss their future development of such sites.

David Aldwinckle (Magna Housing Property Director) and Louise Davidson (Magna Housing Property Manager) attended the Planning and Environment Committee Meeting to address the Committee's concerns.

The Committee heard that Magna Housing had commissioned tests to find if the proposed development would impact negatively on the daylight enjoyed by the habitable room windows of the existing buildings and sunlight tests to find if the proposed development would adversely affect the amount of sunlight into neighbouring gardens in accordance to the Building Research Establishment's Best Practice Guidelines. Members noted that there was no impact of the levels of daylight and that apart from at 8am, where there was a small increase in overshadowing, the proposed changes would provide a small decrease in the overshadowing caused by the current garages.

The Committee heard that the garages that were let, were being used for storage rather than for parking vehicles and that only four of the tenants resided in Eddison Avenue. In order to mitigate the Committee's concerns Members heard that it would be possible to create four extra parking spaces.

The Committee noted that the proposed modular homes would be quick to erect and would be energy efficient.

The Committee asked if it was possible to amend the application so as to reposition the proposed properties to prevent the feeling of overbearing to neighbouring properties and heard the only way that it would be possible would be if the number of homes built, decreased, which would not be economically viable.

The Committee was asked if they would retract their initial response to the application and proceed to support the application.

The Committee considered the request and agreed to raise no objection to the application. The Committee welcomed Magna's efforts for being innovative and introducing modular construction to the Town, particularly for its environmentally friendly qualities.

### **Resolved**

That the Clerk to the Committee notify the Dorset Council that Dorchester Town Council has no objection to planning application WD/D/19/002366 Land and Garages Rear of 13-19 Eddison Avenue, Dorchester.

### **77. Traffic and Parking**

Members heard that Matthew Piles, Corporate Director – Economic Growth and Infrastructure, Dorset Council had been invited to attend the meeting to discuss a Traffic and Parking Strategy for Dorchester but was unable to attend. The Committee heard that correspondence had been received from Matthew Piles' Office and that the Dorset Council were in the middle of an exercise that was looking at the whole of the Dorset Council area regarding parking and that Dorchester was included within that exercise.

Members agreed that the Town Clerk should write to Matthew Piles and invite him to attend a Planning and Environment Committee meeting to discuss a Traffic and Parking Strategy for Dorchester.

The Committee also requested that the Parking Services Manager be invited to a meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee to discuss the upcoming review of Car Park charges.

**Resolved**

- i) That the Town Clerk write to Matthew Piles, Corporate Director – Economic Growth and Infrastructure and invite him to attend a Planning and Environment Committee meeting to discuss a Traffic and Parking Strategy for Dorchester.
- ii) That the Clerk to the Committee invite Dorset Council’s Parking Service Manager to a meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee to discuss the upcoming review of Car Park charges.

**78. Update from the Community Highways Officer**

Members received a verbal update from the Community Highways Officer.

The Committee noted that the Dorset Council had begun the initial primary consultation process for the proposal for ‘no waiting at any time’ restrictions (double yellow lines) in Ashley Road/Monmouth Road, Culliford Road/Monmouth Road and Southcourt Avenue/Rothesay Road, Dorchester.

The primary consultation for the request for ‘no waiting at any time’ restrictions (double yellow lines) in Mellstock Avenue and Weatherbury Way had received two objections from members of the public and would go before the Northern Area Planning Committee.

Members heard that complaints had been received about parking in Coburg Road, particularly at the start and end of the school day. Incidents of busses being unable to pass and emergency services being unable to gain access had been reported. Members heard that the Dorset Council Road Safety Officer had been made aware of the problems being experienced and would be looking into the matter with the possibility of refreshing the existing markings and looking for other solutions to resolve the problems experienced.

A Member suggested that removing the bollards that separate Coburg Road and Holmead Walk may alleviate the situation.

A Member of the Council asked if there were any measures that could be taken to prevent parking at the entrance of the Dorset Council Car Park and blocking the entrance to the alleyway that runs parallel to Lidl at Northernhay but heard that as it was private land, little could be done to enforce any restrictions.

79. **‘A&E Local’ for Poole Hospital – the Retention of Daytime A&E Care at Poole**  
The Committee considered a request from Defend Dorset NHS Residents Group for Dorchester Town Council to write to Dorset CCG and to Dorset Council Health Scrutiny Committee, to support ‘A&E Local’ for Poole Hospital – the retention of daytime A&E care at Poole.

The Committee felt that Dorchester Town Council’s responsibility was to intervene if there would be a direct impact to Dorchester residents but felt on this occasion consultations had previously taken place regarding the matter and that the Dorset CCG would have assessed the implications to Dorchester residents from the information gathered from the consultations.

The Committee agreed that no formal action should be taken.

**Resolved**

That no formal action be taken.

80. **Planning Applications for Comment**  
The Committee considered the planning applications referred to the Council for comment by Dorset Council.

Two members of the public attended the meeting to raise their concerns about Applications WD/D/20/000055 & WD/D/20/000056 51 High West Street, Dorchester, DT1 1UT.

**Resolved**

That Dorset Council be notified of the comments agreed on the various planning applications as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes.

81. **Minute Update Report**  
There were no Minute Updates to report.

82. **Planning Issues to Note**  
That the Planning Issues to Note report be received.

83. **Urgent Items**

**Dorchester Prison Site**

The Committee noted that the Prison site had been advertised for sale. The Committee deeply regretted the lack of progress of any development on the site.

**Dorset County Hospital**

The Committee noted that works to remove the trees in preparation for the multi storey car park at the Dorset County Hospital had begun. Members were disappointed that the works had begun before Planning Approval had been granted but noted that it was necessary to remove the trees before the nesting season.

**Network Rail**

A Member informed the Committee that Network Rail had felled a number of mature trees along the embankment running behind Monmouth Road. The Committee was particularly disappointed that the felling had revealed a quantity of litter along the embankment that subsequently hadn't been removed and felt that the loss of the trees was detrimental to the Town's Climate Emergency Plans.

Chairman

**Appendix 1**  
**Dorchester Town Council**  
**Planning and Environment Committee – 2 March 2020**

**East Ward (Councillors T. Harries, S. Jones, F. Kent-Ledger and R. Major)**

**1 WD/D/20/000177 FLAX FACTORY, ST GEORGES ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 1PE**

Outline application for conversion of existing building to create 8no. terraced houses & extension to create 1no. new terraced house.

Objection.

The Committee had concerns about the proposed vehicular access and the lack of visibility for motorists leaving or entering the site, therefore having a detrimental effect on road safety, contravening Com. 7 of the adopted Local Plan. The Committee felt the proposal for an additional property on the site (in comparison to the previous outline application) would constitute as over development of the site and would have an adverse effect on the neighbouring residents through loss of privacy and over bearing impact, contravening ENV.16 of the adopted Local Plan. The Committee also felt the design of the buildings was not in keeping with the character of the area and would contravene ENV.12 of the adopted Local Plan.

**North Ward (Councillor A. Canning)**

**2 WD/D/20/000006 7 MALTA CLOSE, DORCHESTER, DT1 2QA**

Erection of single storey and two storey extensions (demolition of existing garage and rear and side extensions).

No objection.

**3 WD/D/19/003155 7 LINDEN AVENUE, DORCHESTER, DT1 1EJ**

Conversion of coach house to form residential accommodation and modify existing vehicular access. Demolish first floor side extension, alterations to include installation of roof light and pitched roof to garage.

No objection.

**4 WD/D/20/000055 51 HIGH WEST STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1UT**

Partial removal of boundary wall and creation of parking area.

Objection.

The Committee objected strongly to the application and considered the loss of the wall and creation of car parking within the garden of this property inappropriate and detrimental to the conservation area and the setting of a listed building contravening Policy ENV 4 of the adopted Local Plan.



The Committee supported the Article 4 Direction covering this site and considered that this would protect the historic character of the Conservation Area. They considered that the garden wall was an intrinsic part of the streetscape character of the Dorchester Conservation Area.

The Committee noted the Dorset Council's Highway Engineer's comments, 'It is important to note that the car parking as indicated will not work as indicated due to the width clearance to the rear of the 2 spaces on the eastern side and in reality, only one space is likely to be achievable in this position.' and felt the removal of the wall would not be justifiable.

**5 WD/D/20/000056 51 HIGH WEST STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1UT (Listed Building Consent)**  
Partial removal of boundary wall and creation of parking area.

Objection.

The Committee objected strongly to the application and considered the loss of the wall and creation of car parking within the garden of this property inappropriate and detrimental to the conservation area and the setting of a listed building contravening Policy ENV 4 of the adopted Local Plan.

The Committee supported the Article 4 Direction covering this site and considered that this would protect the historic character of the Conservation Area. They considered that the garden wall was an intrinsic part of the streetscape character of the Dorchester Conservation Area.

The Committee noted the Dorset Council's Highway Engineer's comments, 'It is important to note that the car parking as indicated will not work as indicated due to the width clearance to the rear of the 2 spaces on the eastern side and in reality, only one space is likely to be achievable in this position.' and felt the removal of the wall would not be justifiable.

**6 WD/D/20/000113 UNIT A, 20 GROVE TRADING ESTATE, DORCHESTER**  
Outline Application for the Extension of the existing premises, together with removal of containers.

No objection.

**7 WD/D/20/000226 CO-OP, 8 THE FORUM CENTRE, TRINITY STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1TT**  
Replacement of existing refrigeration plant with new, redecoration of the shop front to include window & door frames, fascia boards & installation of external lighting.

No objection.

**8 WD/D/20/000275 3 GREAT WESTERN ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 1UF**  
Demolition of existing external blockwork store and partial demolition of existing utility. Erection of garden room extension.

No objection.

**9 WD/D/20/000277 9 VICTORIA ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 1SB**

Erection of a replacement conservatory.

No objection.

**West Ward (Councillors L. Fry, J. Hewitt and R. Ricardo)**

**10 WD/D/20/000059 58 GARFIELD AVENUE, DORCHESTER, DT1 2EZ**

Erection of single storey rear extension (demolition of existing conservatory).

No objection.

**11 WD/D/20/000076 9 FOSSE GREEN, DORCHESTER, DT1 2RR**

Erection of single storey rear extension.

Objection.

The Committee agreed that the height, mass and scale of the proposed extension would be unduly prominent, overbearing and dominant when viewed from the neighbouring properties. The resultant overshadowing and oppressive impact of the extension would thus be detrimental to the residential amenity of both neighbouring occupiers and, therefore, the proposal was considered to be detrimental to the residential amenity of the area, contravening ENV. 16 of the adopted Local Plan.

**12 WD/D/20/000220 2 ROMULUS CLOSE, DORCHESTER, DT1 2TH**

Erection of two-storey rear extension (demolish existing single-storey, lean-to extension) . External alterations.

No objection.

**South Ward (Councillors G. Jones, R. Potter and M. Rennie)**

**13 WD/D/20/000166 7 GROSVENOR ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 2BB**

Erection of garage and single storey extension (demolition of existing garage and conservatory)

No objection.

**14 WD/D/20/000207 6 SOUTH COURT AVENUE, DORCHESTER, DT1 2BX**

Raise ridge line of roof and form accommodation in roof space.

No objection.

**15 WD/D/20/000206 13 WEYMOUTH AVENUE, DORCHESTER, DT1 1QR**

Change of Use from Delicatessen & Coffee Bar to I/Restaurant with Class A3.

No objection.

- 16 WD/D/20/000188 TESCO STORES LTD, WEYMOUTH AVENUE, DORCHESTER, DT1 2RY**  
Display of 1no. internally illuminated LCD media screen & 2no. non-illuminated flag pole signs

No objection.

- 17 WD/D/20/000255 2 MARSDEN STREET, POUNDBURY, DORCHESTER, DT1 3DH**  
Erect single storey rear extension.

No objection.

### **Additional Applications**

#### **West Ward (Councillors L. Fry, J. Hewitt and R. Ricardo)**

- 18 WD/D/20/000308 51 DAMERS ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 2LA**  
Demolition of existing lean to conservatory and erection of single storey lean to extension.

No objection.

- 19 WD/D/20/000147 1 BLAGDON ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 2JN**  
Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Formation of vehicular access and parking area.

No objection.

#### **North Ward (Councillors A. Canning)**

- 20 WD/D/19/002448 9 HIGH WEST STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1UJ**  
Display of 1 Non Illuminated Fascia Advertising Sign and 1 hanging sign(retrospective).

No objection.

- 21 WD/D/19/003004 9 HIGH WEST STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1UJ Listed Building Consent**  
External alterations to facilitate display of advertising signs.

No objection.

- 22 WD/D/19/002922 1 COLLITON STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1XH Listed Building Consent**  
Renew front door.

No objection.

- 23 WD/D/20/000301 31 ST HELENS ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 1SD**  
Erect single storey rear extension.

No objection.

**24 WD/D/20/000278 UNIT 12/13 TUDOR ARCADE, SOUTH STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1BN**  
Change of use from (A1 use) shop to (A3 use) café.

No objection.

**Dorchester Town Council**  
**Planning and Environment Committee – 30 March 2020**  
**Agenda Item 3 Request for Parking Restrictions**

Dorset Council have received complaints about parking in Coburg Road, particularly at the start and end of the school day. Incidents of busses being unable to pass and emergency services being unable to gain access had been reported. The Dorset Council Road Safety Officer has recommended the installation of a single line timed restriction, weekdays only, joining up the two bus bays along Coburg Road.

The markings of the existing bus bays will be refreshed and a request for School Keep Clear markings to be installed outside the Dorchester Middle School will be requested in due course.

Members are asked if they would support the request for the installation of a single line timed restriction, weekdays only, joining up the two bus bays along Coburg Road as indicated below.



**DORCHESTER TOWN COUNCIL  
PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE – 30 MARCH 2020**

**DORSET LOCAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT**

1. As part of its development of a new Local Plan the Dorset Council recently ran two workshops; one with Parish Councils, the other with Towns and larger Parishes. Members have received a copy of the presentation provided to the Towns workshop, which was attended by the Committee Chair and Town Clerk.
2. The workshop discussed a series of questions in short time, with the offer that Councils could submit more detailed responses by a March-end deadline.
3. The Clerk and Chair have prepared the attached draft response to the questions, also taking advice from Fera Urbanism, who assisted the Council with responses to the West Dorset Local Plan exercises.
4. The document is fairly comprehensive, but if Members identify additional relevant material the Clerk will consider how to incorporate it into a final version to be signed off by the Chair.
5. This exercise does not cover specific sites. The timescale for that part of the plan making process is still understood to be Autumn 2020.
6. It is **RECOMMENDED** that the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Committee Chair, send a final response to the exercise based on the attached document, supplemented by additional relevant contributions raised by Members.

Adrian Stuart  
Town Clerk

## DORSET LOCAL PLAN: PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS

### 1. **Settlement Hierarchy**

*The preferred approach to selecting villages for inclusion in the settlement hierarchy is to include all settlements of around 500 population or more and to give consideration to the number of facilities and journey time to nearby town. Do you agree with this approach?*

We see no reason for excluding any towns or villages from the settlement hierarchy. It is quite conceivable that some of the 30+ villages that you are looking to exclude may have developable land within their parish boundary.

Development would sustain, indeed enhance, those settlements and may lead to the introduction of new facilities. We are aware of a number of smaller settlements who are not objecting to housing development in their area, where the current absence of a development boundary is frustrating development.

### 2. **Focus for Growth**

*The main towns (Tier 1 and 2 of the settlement hierarchy) play an important role in providing for their rural hinterland. These settlements will be the focus for growth thereby helping to reduce car based travel. Do you agree with this approach?*

We do not accept that the tier 1 and 2 towns should be the focus for growth, simply due to a presumption that residents in surrounding villages will automatically visit their local town on a regular basis.

The journey patterns of village residents, and indeed those in towns, are far more sophisticated than the assumption implies, with journeys based around work, schooling, shopping and leisure based on need and preference rather than the shortest distance.

Growth of the main towns on the scale envisaged will inevitably be at some distance from the town centre or local facilities, with many residents of new developments opting to use cars for their journeys, which again may not be related to the town in which they have been able to set up home.

Nor does the focus take account of ever changing work patterns and technological opportunities, including the ability to work at home, the rural economy, the move away from public transport to shared autonomous transport, or potential new ways of delivering education or healthcare.

Restricting growth in smaller settlements limits the potential for existing or new forms of public or shared transport to develop, leaving the elderly in particular, who make up the largest and growing single component, with no choice but to carry on using the car.

There is a fundamental mismatch between the hierarchy definitions and the way they have been imposed on settlements. Clearly villages which play a role as suburbs to market towns could reasonably be expected to play a greater role in the

expansion of those towns, while villages such as Wool and Crossways, already served by the train, are also ignored. Individual villages along a stretch of road could be grouped together, for example in the Blackmore Vale, to have the same capacity as a small town. There are a host of villages, some distance from towns, that clearly survive without a clear connection to a market town and where development, even though at first sight potentially disproportionate, would enhance those settlements.

3. **Facilities**

*The assessment of facilities is based on having at least 3 important facilities. Which facilities do you think should be taken into account? (7 examples given)*

The current availability of facilities should not be a factor in determining suitability for growth. New technology has already facilitated changes to how services are enjoyed and this will continue to evolve.

The Local Plan is a 20 year strategy and should take account of rapid change due to the response to the climate emergency and to technological innovation. The adaptation of community meeting places to provide opportunities to receive services such as education or healthcare diagnosis; over time green electric and autonomous vehicles will assist home shopping; play spaces are often provided as part of a development, enhancing play opportunities for existing residents of smaller settlements, although traditionally opportunities for play in rural areas are less dependent on formal play spaces.

Technology is likely to allow new ways of delivering services that have long been surrendered to the towns, as witnessed by the use of current technologies to support a return to home working and home delivery, neither of which were included in the Local Plans 10 and 20 years ago. Many villages are, as a result, at their most economically active for years and it would be disastrous to reverse this trend.

Which facilities are considered most important will inevitably vary by location. An excellent shop or leisure opportunity 30 minutes away would in many instances trump a poor offer nearby. Employment space offering craft-based work would not suit a graduate physicist.

And why three important facilities, why not two or four?

4. **Acceptable Journey Times**

*Acceptable journey times to nearby towns is considered to be up to 30 minutes by public transport or up to 15 minutes by car. Do you agree with this approach?*

Our view is that there is little point in a planning authority seeking to impose what they see as acceptable travel times onto developments. Acceptability will be determined by those who choose to live in, or indeed are forced into, a location.



The push/pull factors about where people choose to live, and work are invariable nothing to do with journey times. Only long commutes such as trains to London on regular basis, where cost, unreliability and long hours away from home push people to seek work closer to home. Car-based commutes on a smaller town/village basis are not notably affected by what is considered acceptable/unacceptable; quality of village life and the geographical availability of work (e.g. public sector hubs, retail etc) are relatively fixed.

Taken to a logical conclusion, because there can be no control over the housing market, workers will be obliged to journey as far or further from their new edge of town property to a distant town for work as they would had the property been built in a village. A simple analysis of postcodes for current main employers is likely to demonstrate how many are already willing to journey far more than the times suggested.

The proposal ignores the fundamental shift in the use of transport, with both technology enabling residents to undertake more tasks from home, while autonomous, green electric vehicles ultimately have the potential to replace old-fashioned and uneconomic public transport options. Given the life of the plan it should take account of this progressive shift.

Finally, journey times are also extremely variable, as anyone accessing Dorchester will know! The constraints and pinch points due to rivers, bypasses etc. will also need to be taken into account.

## **5. Concerns**

*Are there any concerns from a town council's perspective?*

The proposals as phrased too readily accept the continued push towards the overdevelopment of towns, with a consequential decline of villages. Embracing new ideas around technology and transport could provide innovative solutions that reverse this trend. The new Local Plan, based on a much larger county area, represents a perfect moment to reboot the system and not just carry on with business as usual and old-fashioned thinking.

Issues such as the Climate Emergency, Brexit and even the COVID-19 outbreak are starting to stress test old ways of working and push us very quickly into new forms of travel, work and interaction. There is a case for waiting to learn the lesson from this and develop an innovative Local Plan, responsive to this emerging brave new world.

As recent experience nationally has demonstrated, towns are no longer always built in the right place. While their growth historically may have been logical, whether they are still in the right place given current behaviours, employment trends and movement choices is questionable. Or rather, are our current behaviours, employment trends, movement choices the correct ones for the historic towns and villages we are living and working in?

The national trend towards focusing development on towns has created many problems associated with highways routes being placed under pressure, while there are too many examples of a failure to understand the implications of flood plain development, based on a model of intensification or expansion that relies upon the use of out-dated 20<sup>th</sup> Century tech such as regular use of the private motor car, commuting rather than home-working and so on. We need to find another, better way to support both towns and villages?

A fixed approach to focus development on already overburdened infrastructure takes no account of the potential of many smaller settlements to absorb and take advantage of development.

## **6. Town's Current Role**

*What do you consider is the current role of your town?*

Dorchester is first and foremost a public service centre. As such its hospital, schools and local government services all act as a magnet for workers and service users, often journeying far longer distances than any arbitrary parameters set within the Local Plan.

It is also very attractive to visitors, especially with its developing Heritage Tourism quarter, and how these visitors access the town and park in it will need to be taken into account.

The town also plays the role of a traditional market town, providing retail and professional services for its own residents, those of nearby Weymouth and the villages, and workers from far and wide.

Dorchester already has an imbalance of residents across the age range, with a greater than usual proportion of retired people and a distinct dearth of younger active workers in the range 20-40. The town is at risk of becoming a retirement home, with too much of its recent development focused on the needs of those who can afford to live in the town the most, the wealthy elderly. Future development within the town needs to resist and deliberately reverse this steady shift.

## **7. Priorities**

*What issues are your priorities? (6 suggestions)*

The town has a growing number of important priorities and it is not easy to identify which of them is the biggest and why

They include

- finding a proper balance between the competing needs of residents, workers and visitors to arrive at, move about and park their vehicles;
- the delivery of housing at a price that is affordable to the young workers who will provide the town's services in the long term;
- making a constructive and positive contribution to resolving the climate emergency; and

- recognising and adapting to the fact that our retail infrastructure no longer provides for the logistics requirements of larger retailers.

Not least among our priorities is to ensure that the future development of the town is consistent with its own needs and does not simply becoming the primary location for inappropriate housing as a result of government targets, adherence to an incorrect and already out of date mantra that “development should be focused in the vicinity of Dorchester”, the long held ambitions of local landowners or the natural outcome of the lack of a genuine, defensible process for a robust search across the Dorset Council area.

Councillor Robin Potter  
Chair, Planning & Environment Committee  
Dorchester Town Council

Adrian Stuart  
Town Clerk

**Appendix 1**  
**Dorchester Town Council**  
**Planning and Environment Committee – 30 March 2020**

**North Ward (Councillor A. Canning)**

1. [WD/D/20/000416 THE CORN EXCHANGE, HIGH EAST STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1HF](#)  
Installation of replacement lift.  
As Dorchester Town Council is the applicant, no comment will be made on this application.
2. [WD/D/20/000378 20-22 HIGH WEST STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1UW](#)  
Proposed rear single storey extension and conversion of plant room into customer area.
3. [WD/D/20/000379 20-22 HIGH WEST STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1UW Listed Building Consent](#)  
Proposed rear single storey extension and conversion of plant room into customer area.
4. [WD/D/20/000512 5 NORTH SQUARE, DORCHESTER, DT1 1HY](#)  
Internal and External alterations to accommodate A1 / A2 use at Ground floor & 2No one bedroom flats.
5. [WD/D/20/000513 5 NORTH SQUARE, DORCHESTER, DT1 1HY Listed Building Consent](#)  
Internal and External alterations to accommodate A1 / A2 use at Ground floor & 2No one bedroom flats.
6. [WD/D/20/000344 43 HIGH EAST STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1HN Listed Building Consent](#)  
Replacement of single glaze window to double glaze.

**West Ward (Councillors L. Fry, J. Hewitt and R. Ricardo)**

7. [WD/D/20/000346 3A EDWARD ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 2HJ](#)  
First floor rear extension including alterations to rear elevation.

**South Ward (Councillors G. Jones, R. Potter and M. Rennie)**

8. [WD/D/20/000262 8 COPPER STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1GH](#)  
Change of use from A1 (retail/nano brewery) to mix use of A1 (retail/nano brewery) and A4 (drinking establishment).
9. [WD/D/20/000246 1 EGDON ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 2EA](#)  
Erection of two storey extension to form annex accommodation. Modify existing vehicular access and create additional parking.
10. [WD/D/20/000629 30 SOUTH COURT AVENUE, DORCHESTER, DT1 2BX](#)  
Demolition of detached garage, back extension and conservatory & Erection of attached garage, single storey side extension, single storey rear extension and raised decking.

**Dorchester Town Council**  
**Planning and Environment Committee – 30 March 2020**  
**Agenda Item 8 Planning Issues to Note**

**1. WD/D/18/002376 5 DRAGONS COURT, DORCHESTER, DT1 1WR**

Recommended Refusal by Dorchester Town Council's Planning and Environment Committee held on 5 November 2018.

Approved by the Dorset Council 3 March 2020.

Extract from the Delegated Officer's report:

*'11.2 Amenity*

*11.2.1 Within both the consultation response received from Dorchester Town Council and the letter of representation made, concerns were raised with regards to the proposed development's impact on neighbour amenity. Concerns were equally shared by the case officer that an increase in the height of the shared boundary wall with 1 Long Bridge Road in stone would both overshadow and appear overbearing to an opening along the eastern elevation of 1 Long Bridge Road which sits within close proximity to the shared boundary; detrimental to the amenity currently enjoyed by the occupiers of this property.*

*11.2.2 As a result, following discussions between the case officer and applicant, amended drawings were submitted proposing a section of trellis to sit above the shared boundary wall. The trellis would sit at a height of approximately 2.1 metres. On this point, it is noted that under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) the applicant would be able to increase the height of the wall to 2 metres exercising their permitted development rights. Given the proposed wall would be a modest increase to this allowance finished with a penetrable structure to allow for daylight to pass through whilst also securing an element of privacy.*

*11.2.3 In light of the proposed amendments to the scheme it is considered the proposed development would satisfactorily safeguard the amenity enjoyed by occupiers of neighbouring residential property and occupiers of 5 Dragon Court'*

**2. WD/D/19/002902 50 LONDON ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 1NE**

Recommended refusal by Dorchester Town Council's Planning and Environment Committee held on Monday, 6 January 2020.

Approved by the Dorset Council 3 March 2020.

Extract from the Delegated Officer's Report:

*'11.3 The proposed development does not significantly adversely impact the living conditions of the neighbouring properties through overbearing impact, unacceptable levels of overshadowing or loss of privacy. The single storey side extension to form store at the front is stepped in from the west side boundary with a roof pitch towards the existing two storey house the extension to the rear of store is further stepped in from the side boundary with a*

*flat roof. The overshadowing onto the neighbouring building and loss of light onto windows to the west of the site is not to an unacceptable level with the windows towards the rear elevation to the site to the west and adjacent to the flat roof on the single storey side extension. The extension from the rear elevation has a flat roof and the attached house to the east of the site has extended from the rear elevation. The side elevation window on the dormer is to be made partially obscurely glazed. There is fence screening on the rear garden boundary and side west boundary.*

*11.4 The proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of occupiers of residential properties.'*