

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

2 September 2020

Agenda for the meeting of the **Planning and Environment Committee** which will be held via the ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCING PLATFORM on Monday, 7 September 2020 commencing at 7.00pm.

Adrian Stuart Town Clerk

You will be able to join the meeting by using the link: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81152054181

Public Speaking at the Meeting

The Chairman has discretion to allow members of the public to speak at the meeting. If you wish to speak please contact the Clerk by 9.00am on the morning 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 3 August 2020.

3. Dorchester South Station

To discuss the current appearance of Dorchester South Train Station.

4. Dorset Council Draft Licencing Policy

To note the Dorset Council's Licensing Policy Consultation which can be found at https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/business-consumers-licences/licences-li

Members are invited to submit any responses via email to the Committee Chair and Clerk for consideration. *Please note the consultation closes on 27 September 2020.*

5. Dorset Council Draft Gambling Policy

To note the Dorset Council's Gambling Policy which can be found at https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/your-council/consultations/pdfs/gambling/dorset-council-statement-of-gambling-licensing-policy-2021-24-draft-v-11.pdf and to authorise the Committee Clerk, in consultation with the Chair to make response.

Members are invited to submit any responses via email to the Committee Chair and Clerk for consideration. *Please note the consultation closes on 27 September 2020.*

6. Changes to the Current Planning System Consultation on Changes to Planning Policy and Regulations

To consider the attached draft response from Dorchester Town Council to the Ministry of Local Housing, Communities and Local Government's Consultation on Changes to Planning Policy and Regulations which can be found at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907215/200805 Changes to the current planning system FINAL version.pdf and to authorise the Committee Clerk, in consultation with the Chair to make response.

Members are invited to submit any responses to the Clerk and Committee Chair for consideration. *Please note the consultation closes on 1 October 2020.*

7. Cycling and Walking Plans

Members to receive a report regarding Dorset Council's Plans on Cycling and walking, (Report to follow).

8. Flood Risk Management Works in and Around Dorchester

To note the Environment Agency's August update (attached).

9. Planning Applications for Comment

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

10. Minute Update Report

To receive and consider the minute updates reported.

11. 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.

Agenda Item 6

Changes to the Current Planning System Consultation on Changes to Planning Policy and Regulations

- 1. The consultation seeks views on a range of proposed changes to the current planning system including:
 - changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need
 - securing of First Homes through developer contributions
 - temporarily lifting the small sites threshold
 - extending the current Permission in Principle to major development

Members have received a presentation (via video link https://dorset-aptc.us15.list-manage.com/track/click?u=4cb25b50ab3e42c918d538200&id=ac9320f3bc&e=62b8791871) giving further clarity on the proposed changes to the Planning Policy and Regulations delivered by Cornwall Council.

- 2. The Chair and Clerk have prepared the attached draft response to the questions.
- 3. 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.
- 4. It is **RECOMMENDED** that the Clerk to the Committee, in consultation with the Committee Chair, send a final response to the consultation based on the attached document, supplemented by additional relevant contributions raised by Members which should be emailed to the Committee Clerk.

Georgina Wakely Committee Clerk.

Changes to the Current Planning System

Step 1 Setting the baseline – providing stability and certainty by incorporating a blend of household projections and stock

Q1: Do you agree that planning practice guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is whichever is the higher of the level of 0.5% of housing stock in each local authority area OR the latest household projections averaged over a 10-year period?

No, we believe that the appropriate baseline for the standard method should be based on household projections only. There is no merit in insisting on new homes where there is no need within a particular locality.

Q2: In the stock element of the baseline, do you agree that 0.5% of existing stock for the standard method is appropriate? If not, please explain why.

No, 0.5% of existing stock for the standard method is not appropriate. If the duty to cooperate has been removed, a Unitary Authority with tightly drawn borders would be unable to cope with additional housing away from where it was required.

Step 2 Adjusting for market signals – maintaining price signals using the current affordability ratio and the change in affordability over the last 10 years

Q3: Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio from the most recent year for which data is available to adjust the standard method's baseline is appropriate? If not, please explain why.

No response

Q4: Do you agree that incorporating an adjustment for the change of affordability over 10 years is a positive way to look at whether affordability has improved? If not, please explain why.

No response

Q5: Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the standard method? If not, please explain why.

No response

Do you agree that authorities should be planning having regard to their revised standard method need figure, from the publication date of the revised guidance, with the exception of:

Q6: Authorities which are already at the second stage of the strategic plan consultation process (Regulation 19), which should be given 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate for examination?

No response

Q7: Authorities close to publishing their second stage consultation (Regulation 19), which should be given 3 months from the publication date of the revised guidance to publish their

Regulation 19 plan, and a further 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate?

No response

If not, please explain why. Are there particular circumstances which need to be catered for?

Q8: The Government is proposing policy compliant planning applications will deliver a minimum of 25% of onsite affordable housing as First Homes, and a minimum of 25% of offsite contributions towards First Homes where appropriate.

Which do you think is the most appropriate option for the remaining 75% of affordable housing secured through developer contributions?

Please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):

- i) Prioritising the replacement of affordable home ownership tenures, and delivering rental tenures in the ratio set out in the local plan policy.
- ii) Negotiation between a local authority and developer.
- iii) Other (please specify)
- i) Prioritising the replacement of affordable home ownership tenures, and delivering rental tenures in the ratio set out in the local plan policy. This avoids lengthy negotiations and trade off between the developer and local authority which would provide clarity and certainty, resulting in increased efficiency and faster build times.

With regards to current exemptions from delivery of affordable home ownership products:

Q9: Should the existing exemptions from the requirement for affordable home ownership products (e.g. for build to rent) also apply to apply to this First Homes requirement? No response.

Q10: Are any existing exemptions not required? If not, please set out which exemptions and why.

No response.

Q11: Are any other exemptions needed? If so, please provide reasons and /or evidence for your views.

There should be no exemptions. All sites should be required to deliver affordable homes as a prerequisite to development

Local plans and transitional arrangements

Q12: Do you agree with the proposed approach to transitional arrangements set out above? No, policies require consistency. If the policy is right, then it should be adhered to.

Level of discount

Q13: Do you agree with the proposed approach to different levels of discount?

Yes.

In reference to paragraph 61, It must be remembered that First Homes will still contain people, therefore the Community Infrastructure Levy must still be so as to ensure that all levels can provide proper amenities.

Q14: Do you agree with the approach of allowing a small proportion of market housing on First Homes exception sites, in order to ensure site viability?

In principle yes, but 'small' must be clearly defined and must be small. For instance, 1 out of 3; up to 3 out of 10; no more than 15% thereafter.

Q15: Do you agree with the removal of the site size threshold set out in the National Planning Policy Framework?

Yes

Q16: Do you agree that the First Homes exception sites policy should not apply in designated rural areas?

Yes

For each of these questions, please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):

Q17: Do you agree with the proposed approach to raise the small sites threshold for a time-limited period?

No, for example; 40 homes without an affordable component is far too large.

Q18: What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold?

- i) Up to 40 homes
- ii) Up to 50 homes
- iii) Other (please specify)

It would not be unreasonable to increase the small sites threshold to 25 which would help to support SME's but alleviate some of the risk of existing applications being withdrawn and resubmitted to avoid contributions.

Q19: Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold? In principle, yes.

Q20: Do you agree with linking the time-limited period to economic recovery and raising the threshold for an initial period of 18 months?

No response.

Q21: Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects? No response.

Q22: Do you agree with the Government's proposed approach to setting thresholds in rural areas?

No response.

Q23: Are there any other ways in which the Government can support SME builders to deliver new homes during the economic recovery period?

It would be beneficial if Central Government helped to enable SME's to refurbish brownfield sites.

Q24: Do you agree that the new Permission in Principle should remove the restriction on major development?

No, this would be advantageous to large developers at the expense of SME's. To alleviate this it would not be unreasonable to raise the threshold to 50 or 2HA.

Q25: Should the new Permission in Principle for major development set any limit on the amount of commercial development (providing housing still occupies the majority of the floorspace of the overall scheme)? Please provide any comments in support of your views. Yes. The need is for more housing and particularly more affordable housing. Some commercial / retail is obviously essential, but this should be no more than 25% of the area.

Q26: Do you agree with our proposal that information requirements for Permission in Principle by application for major development should broadly remain unchanged? If you disagree, what changes would you suggest and why? Yes.

Q27: Should there be an additional height parameter for Permission in Principle? Please provide comments in support of your views.

Yes, but in meters, not in storeys. High-rise buildings are very unlikely to be suitable in a rural area and the local authority should be able to give an early indication that such a development would be unwelcome.

Q28: Do you agree that publicity arrangements for Permission in Principle by application should be extended for large developments? If so, should local planning authorities be:

- i) required to publish a notice in a local newspaper?
- ii) subject to a general requirement to publicise the application or
- iii) both?
- iv) disagree

Both and more. This is vital for local accountability. Local newspapers may not exist or be widely read, local radio stations are also in wide decline, so wide use of all media, social and traditional as appropriate for local circumstance. Statutory bodies and local councillors should be informed early in the process.

Q29: Do you agree with our proposal for a banded fee structure based on a flat fee per hectarage, with a maximum fee cap?

Yes.

Q30: What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why? We don't have sight of what the costs might be so cannot comment.

Q31: Do you agree that any brownfield site that is granted Permission in Principle through the application process should be included in Part 2 of the Brownfield Land Register? If you disagree, please state why.

In principle, yes.

Q32: What guidance would help support applicants and local planning authorities to make decisions about Permission in Principle? Where possible, please set out any areas of guidance you consider are currently lacking and would assist stakeholders.

No response

Q33: What costs and benefits do you envisage the proposed scheme would cause? Where you have identified drawbacks, how might these be overcome? The obvious advantage is that it would probably be easier to get permission in principle than outline planning permission at present.

The main disadvantage of this proposal is that planning permission in principle may encourage speculative plans which will not lead to viable development due to the constraints of other policies such as the 7 core principles of the NPPF, the constraints in NPPF chapters 7 to 12 and policies covering landscape, building design and positioning and the amenity of neighbours, existing and future residents.

Q34: To what extent do you consider landowners and developers are likely to use the proposed measure? Please provide evidence where possible.

The relaxed measures will provide some landowners and developers to gain permission for plans that in normal circumstances would not be approved. It is imperative that Local authorities and the Planning regime as a whole continue to consider each application for its suitability and viability for the local area.

Agenda Item 8

Flood Risk Management Works in and Around Dorchester

August-2020¶





We-are-working-to-reduce-flood-risk-in-Dorchester¶

100

Mill-Street-on-the-River-Frome-in-Dorchester, has been identified as a location-where temporary flood-barriers could reduce the impact of flooding. Please read this briefing carefully to make sure that you are aware of what is happening, how this may affect you and what action you need to take.¶

What-are-temporary-barriers-and-how-do-they-work?-¶



Environment-Agency-staff-deployingtypical-a-section-of-barrier¶

- Temporary flood barriers are portable metal frames with a waterproof membrane that can be quickly deployed to help reduce the impact of flooding from a river.
- → When deployed, the barriers create a temporary wall to help reduce the impact of flooding to properties.¶
- It is not unusual for small quantities of water to pool behind the temporary flood barrier. Portable pumps are often deployed to over pump this water, if required ¶

-9

Where-will-the-temporary-flood-barriers-be-deployed?

There-will-be-20-metres-of-1m-high-barrier-deployed-in-the-parking-area-at-the-junction-of-Mill-Street-and-Holloway-Road.¶

The red line on this map shows the position of the barrier section that may be deployed if forecast river-levels are high enough to cause flood risk to properties.



customer service line 03708 506 506

osoo so 70 60

floodline 03459 88 11 88 →



We-will-be-doing-a-practice-deployment-on-29th-September-2020¶

¶

П

On the morning of <u>29th September</u>, the temporary barriers will be deployed on Mill Street between the Old-Mill Flats and Princes Bridge on Holloway Road. The car parking bays at the Old Mill Flats will be unavailable during the practice as this area will be required to deploy the temporary barrier.

¶

Environment-Agency-engagement-staff-will-be-on-site-to-answer-any-urgent-questions-that-you-may-have-during-the-practice-deployment.-We-will-be-observing-the-government-guidelines-on-social-distancing-that-are-in-effect-on-that-date.-Please-respect-these-measures-to-ensure-the-safety-of-our-staff-and-you.-If-the-engagement-staff-are-busy, please-keep-a-safe-distance-until-staff-members-are-free-to-talk.¶

What-do-I-need-to-do?¶

¶

You-should-always-prepare to-take-action-when-at-risk-of-flooding, even-if-a-temporary-barrier-may-be-put-inplace, as-we-cannot-guarantee-that-weather-forecast-information-will-always-allow-for-timely-deployment. ¶

There-are-a-number-of-things-you-can-do-to-prepare-for-flooding-and-be-more-resilient,-to-keep-yourself-and-your-family-safe.-¶

- --You-should-find-out-if-your-home-is-at-risk, sign-up-for-flood-warnings-and-be-ready-to-take-action. For-more-information-visit-www.gov.uk/flood-or-call-*Eloodline*-on-0345-988-1188.¶
- --Monitor-local-water-levels-and-weather-conditions. You-can-check-river-and-sea-levels-in-England-onwww.gov.uk/flood. Visit-the-Met-Office-website-for-local-forecasts-at-www.metoffice.gov.uk.¶
- -·Have·a·plan·of·action; prepare·a·bag·of·essential·items·now·to·take·with·you·if·you·have·to·leave·your-home; have·a·list-of·key·contacts·and-plan·on·where·you·could·go·to·stay·safe. Keep·these·in·a·safe-place. You·could-include-things·like-spare-medication, glasses, clothing, important-documents·and-contact-numbers.¶

¶

We-also-have-plans-for-some-permanent-improvements¶

¶.

We-are-working-on-designs for an improvement at the corner of River Crescent and the Mill Streamfootpath-which-will reduce the need for temporary flood defences in this location. This is where waterflowed out of the Mill Stream into River Crescent in 2012. This will reduce the reliance on and time taken todeploy temporary flood defences in the area. However, it is important to note that it will not form a completeand formal flood defence, and there will still be a residual (but lower) flood risk. ¶

¶.

As part of the design for this improvement we anticipate commencing some site investigation works along the footpath in early September. These works will assess ground conditions in the area and should be completed within one day, but may restrict access to the footpath at certain times whilst this is underway. These investigations will inform the design of this improvement which will be shared with you once we have some drawings completed and prior to any planning or construction.

¶

We-are-also-exploring-whether-revised-government-funding-guidance-will-allow-us-to-progress-with-further-more-permanent-flood-defences-for-the-Dorchester-area.¶

¶

To-find-out-more-about-how-you-can-increase-your-preparedness-for-flooding-and-to-see-any-flood-warnings-in-place-visit: www.qov.uk/check-flood-risk

¶

If-you-require-any-more-information,-please-email:

floodwessex@environment-agency.gov.uk

customer service line 03708 506 506 incident hotline 0800 80 70 60

floodline 03459 88 11 88

Agenda Item 9

Planning Applications for Comment

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

E1. WD/D/20/001650 33 EDDISON AVENUE, DORCHESTER, DT1 1NX

Erect two storey rear extension.

E2. WD/D/20/001757 1 LANCASTER ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 1QH

Erection of flat roof front extension.

E3. WD/D/20/001672 FLAT 6, FORDINGTON HOUSE, ICEN WAY, DORCHESTER, DT1 1NP (Listed Building Consent)

Works to Replace sections of roof tiles.

North Ward (Councillor A. Canning)

N1. WD/D/20/001758 THE BLUE RADDLE, CHURCH STREET, DORCHESTER, DT1 1JN

Change of use of first floor residential accommodation to rooms to be used in conjunction with the public house.

N2. WD/D/20/001775 6 ALBERT ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 1SF

Application for certificate of lawfulness to confirm that planning permission 1/E/87/137 has been implemented & can be completed.

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

No applications received to date.

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

S1. <u>WD/D/20/001674 WEYMOUTH AVENUE RECREATION GROUND, WEYMOUTH AVENUE, DORCHESTER</u>

Display of 1.no non illuminated free standing advertising board.

S2. WD/D/20/001762 64 MONMOUTH ROAD, DORCHESTER, DT1 2DG

Erection of timber annex (demolition of existing garage).

S3. WD/D/20/001555 83 WEATHERBURY WAY, DORCHESTER, DT1 2EE

Erection of single-storey 'wrap around' extension.

Poundbury Ward (Councillors R. Biggs and S. Hosford)

No applications received to date.