



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 10 December 2024

Site visit made on 9 December 2024

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/24/3350320

Land off Manston Road, Sturminster Newton

Grid Ref Easting: 379428 and Grid Ref Northing: 114630

- 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 South West Strategic Developments Limited against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/OUT/2023/01678.
 - The development proposed is Outline application for the erection of up to 50 dwellings and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The emerging Dorset Local Plan (EDLP) has reached a stage where options have been subject to consultation under the provision of Regulation 18. It is therefore at an early stage of preparation, and I have afforded limited weight to the policies of this plan on this basis.
3. An amended indicative layout plan, plan: L0201 rev D, has been submitted that shows how a scheme of up to 50 dwellings could be accommodated on site. This has been submitted by the appellant to seek to address the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. Following discussion, I agreed to accept this on the basis that it would reduce the scale of the proposal by two and my acceptance of it would not prejudice any party. I have therefore also adjusted the description of development in the banner above accordingly. Nevertheless, as this layout is illustrative only, I shall only pay it limited regard in my assessment of the proposal.
4. The proposed scheme is in outline form, with all matters reserved apart from access. Two access points would be provided. The main access would be in the middle of the site's frontage and a second access would be provided to serve a small group of houses in the northwest part of the site. The amended version, plan: L0201 rev D, shows several rows of tree and hedge planting through the sloping site. This demonstrates one way that the scheme could be developed.
5. The Council's Reason for Refusal (RfR) No 2 identified that the site was partly within flood zones 2 and 3 and was therefore vulnerable to fluvial flooding. The RfR stated that in the absence of a sequential test, the proposal had not demonstrated that it could not be placed on land less vulnerable to flooding.

The appellant has provided an alternative redline site plan that has removed the area identified as flood zones from the application site. The Council has stated, in discussion with the Lead Local Flood Authority, that if this site plan is accepted by the Inspector the RfR will have been addressed. The Council has asserted that the remaining flood related matters, offering low risk only, could be addressed through the imposition of a suitable condition. As such, following my acceptance of the revised site plan, I find that this has addressed RfR 2 and does not require further consideration.

6. The Council has stated, in its statement of case, that RfR 3 (with respect to character and appearance) mistakenly referred to policy 2 of the North Dorset Local Plan [2016] (LP) where it meant to refer to LP policies 4 (the Natural Environment) and 24 (Design). This matter was discussed at the hearing, and I am satisfied that these further policies are relevant matters to take into consideration in this appeal.
7. The Secretary of State has recently agreed the Council's 5-year HLS position through an Annual Position Statement (APS), with a base date of April 2024. The Inspector's report, published in October, has confirmed that the Council can demonstrate a 5.02 year Housing Land Supply (HLS) position. This is the most up to date, independent confirmation of the housing land supply and carries substantial weight. Although the new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has removed the ability of Council's to seek an APS, an existing APS will remain in full force until it expires. Furthermore, the Council has a Housing Delivery Test (HDT), published December 2024, resulting in a healthy delivery of 106%.
8. A signed and certified Legal agreement¹ has been submitted. This secures the delivery of a policy compliant provision of 40% affordable housing, the enhancement of existing social infrastructure including education, libraries and health facilities. The Agreement also includes improvements to local public rights of way and allotment provision and in totality is deemed by the Council to address RfR4. Main parties have agreed that the submitted S106 Legal Agreement has addressed the Council's RfR 4. Moreover, the Council's CIL Compliance Statement, and accompanying documents, adequately demonstrate that its requirements are reasonable and necessary for the development to proceed. As a result, I am satisfied that this matter and the RfR has been addressed.
9. A new Framework has been published 16 December 2024. Also, the 2023 Housing Delivery Test Results were published 12 December. I have sought comments from main parties as to the bearing, if any, that these matters have had on arguments that have been advanced. I have taken into account the comments received in my decision.

Main Issues

10. Accordingly, based on the submitted evidence and discussion at the hearing, the main issues are:
 - Whether the proposed development would be in a suitable location, with regard to the settlement strategy set out in the LP, and

¹ S106 Legal Agreement, by Dorset Council, Fiona Mogridge, Anthony Simon Burden, Nicola Sara Paulley and South West Strategic Development Limited, Dated 18 December 2024

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Settlement strategy

11. The LP establishes the Council's approach to the distribution of housing across the district. This seeks, at policy 2, to focus housing within the four main towns of Blandford, Gillingham, Shaftesbury and Sturminster Newton. Lower tier settlements such as Stalbridge and 18 large villages, are considered capable of meeting a degree of growth to meet local and essential needs. The Council's countryside LP policy 20 applies to all development proposed outside of these settlements. This policy states that development outside development boundaries will only be permitted where it is a type appropriate for the countryside or would meet an over-riding need for it to be located in the countryside.
12. As such, Sturminster Newton as a main town, has been identified as suitable for housing growth. The Sturminster Newton Neighbourhood Plan (NP) provides the town's vision for future sustainable development. LP policy 6 sets a minimum housing requirement of at least 395 homes to be built in the town between 2011 and 2031, of which about 95 must be affordable homes. The figure has been increased by more recent housing needs assessment and NP policy 7 identifies a requirement for the town to provide at least 457 homes in the parish over the plan period of 2011-2031, which would meet the LP requirements of LP policy 6.
13. The NP explains that the town is constrained by a combination of the river Stour and its floodplain, topography, landowner restrictions to the north and local road capacities. Nonetheless, sites have been allocated within the settlement and on its fringes, to accommodate new housing development. Several of these sites have since been delivered, others are under construction. As a result, the NP is delivering homes in accordance with its spatial strategy, in locations deemed to be suitable through the NP assessment and allocation process. Focusing new development within the settlement boundary and on allocated sites represents an important component as to how the NP functions. This approach to plan led housing delivery provides certainty for the community and the development industry, identifying suitable locations for new development.
14. The appeal site is outside the defined boundary of Sturminster Newton and is within the open countryside for policy purposes. The appeal site would not infill a plot that is between existing built form and is not surrounded by the settlement boundary on three sides. The existing development to the north and south of the site is sporadic and would not bracket the site, having comparatively shallow plot depths. Furthermore, the scheme would not be perceived as 'rounding off' or completing the adjacent settlement. Instead, it would intrude into the open countryside in a manner discordant with the existing settlement pattern.
15. Accordingly, the site is not deemed to be a suitable location for housing development and would therefore be contrary to LP policies 2, 19 and 20, NP policy 7. These seek, among other matters, for development to take place within the development boundary and to strictly control development in the

countryside. LP policy 6, also referred to in RfR 1, is not deemed to be relevant to this matter as it simply identifies the housing distribution in the district. Therefore, this policy weighs neither for, nor against, the proposal.

Character and appearance

16. As shown by the Council's and appellant's evidence there is a distinction to be made between impact on landscape, which should be treated as a resource, and impact on visual amenity, which is the effect on people observing the development in places where the development can be viewed, such as villages, roads, public rights of way and individual dwellings.

Landscape character

17. Paragraph 187 of the Framework indicates that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised. The appellant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment² (LVIA) explains the character types found in the area. The North Dorset Landscape Character Assessment [2008] NDCA identifies the site as being within the 'North Dorset Limestone Ridges' character area. This corresponds with the Council's Landscape Character Types placing the site within an area defined as 'Limestone Hills'. The Limestone Hills area includes "many scattered villages and farmsteads with a distinctive settlement pattern along the ridges or on the side slopes to the ridges" with Sturminster Newton having "some poorly integrated urban edges"³.
18. Most of Sturminster Newton stands along and beyond the eastern ridge as a plateau settlement, with parts to the south and west extending down the slopes. Although main parties are in dispute as to whether Sturminster Newton is a plateau settlement or a combination of this and a 'hanging' settlement, the settlement has characteristics of both, noting development on the slopes to the south and west, in accordance with the 'Limestone Hill' character type.
19. The adjacent character type is defined as 'Blackmore Vale' in the NDCA and 'Clay Vale' in the Council's character type assessment. This area is identified as being a tranquil and unified area creating "open views across the undulating to flat pastoral landscape to the chalk escarpment backdrop". I find that the appeal site makes a positive contribution more to the 'Blackmore Vale' character type than 'Limestone Hill', being part of the slope and below the ridgeline and being visually connected to the adjacent valley as an arable parcel of land. I therefore find the site to be in an area of transition between two character-type areas.
20. The NP identifies that the town's landform, proximity to the River Stour and its floodplain has constrained growth on the south and eastern edges of the settlement. The NP identifies that the site is within a local character area known as 'Rixon and Eastern Fringe'. This area includes Manston Road which creates a strong demarcation between town and country. NP policy 31 identifies that the ridgeline is particularly sensitive in wider views. It states that further development to the east of Manston Road would be unsuitable, as the topography would make it difficult for landscaping to soften the visual impact of development in wider views.

² Landscape Statement, Wendy Lancaster, August 2024

³ LVIA, paragraph 3.49

21. The Town's Design Statement SPD [2008] notes that in the southern part of the town "houses are seen blending" with the surrounding countryside. Conversely, in the north and north-east of the town it states that "development ends abruptly along the B3091 Manston Road". From my site visit I was able to see a clear delineation between the edge of the eastern boundary of Sturminster Newton and the open countryside beyond. I do not find that the limited development around Sturminster Storage and the dwelling of Tuscans, materially erodes this clear point of transition between urban and rural form. The edge of the settlement therefore forms a hard boundary with the site, marking a clear change in character.
22. From the entrance gate onto Manston Road, I observed that the site slopes relatively continually from the highway down towards Chivrick's Brook, from west to east, with some more gently sloping land evident as the site edge approaches the brook. From the Trailway, I noted that the site forms part of a connected range of fields that form an eastern slope around the edge of the settlement. This connected range of fields is largely uninterrupted by built form. Consequently, whilst partly screened by boundary field hedging and trees, the group of fields form a significant undeveloped feature within the wider landscape from views in the east and southeast. The site and its adjacent fields therefore make an important positive contribution to the local landscape character.
23. On the understanding that the existing housing is visually intrusive in views to the east, I do not agree with the appellant that further development in the sensitive view would ameliorate the negative effects of existing development in this view. The proposed development would intrude into the clearly defined character of the eastern slopes of the settlement causing substantial harm to the local and wider landscape character. Although the settlement pattern of the town includes development on its southern and western slopes, this does not necessarily mean that all development on slopes would have an appropriate effect on the area's landscape character.
24. Therefore, whilst the appellant asserts that the development would extend the poorly resolved edge of housing along the ridge of Manston Road, I find this component of urban form is not of sufficient adverse visual impact to require, or materially benefit from, mitigation by new development. Accordingly, for the above reasons, the development would have a moderate adverse impact on the landscape character of the appeal site and a substantial adverse impact on the wider landscape character of the area.
25. The site is visible from Hambleton Hill, around 5km to the east of the site. This is within the Cranborne Chase National Landscape. Due to the separation distance, the proposal would have a minor adverse magnitude of effect, where mitigation and views of the existing settlement would prevent an adverse effect to the setting of the National Landscape, a conclusion shared by main parties.
26. Having found that the site is rural in character and forms an important buffer at the edge of the settlement, I agree with main parties that the existing housing along Manston Road is visually intrusive in views from the surrounding countryside. Furthermore, I also agree that the proposal would soften the urban edge of Manston Road. However, this gain would be limited and would not outweigh the harm found to landscape character. Furthermore, the

proposed mitigation, in the form of segregated development blocks, and the proposed distribution of green space and planting, would not outweigh the harm found.

Visual effects

27. Visual amenity relates to the direct visual impacts on receptors (people) rather than on the landscape. The LVIA has identified the theoretical zone of visibility and assessed the visual effects of the proposal from several key viewpoints. During my extensive site visit I was able to observe the site, and its context, from several important local viewpoints, including those identified in the LVIA.
28. The appellant's LVIA, in considering visual impact, is based on an assessment of views from 8 representative viewpoints (VP). These VPs are of course a snapshot of the site at a single location at each VP and would not necessarily reflect the experience of receptors walking the Public Right of Way (PRoW) routes. The supplied photographs were taken in the summer when deciduous trees and hedges were in leaf, which somewhat erodes the credibility and usefulness of the assessment as it has not been undertaken in a 'worse case' scenario when the site would be most visible.
29. By contrast, my visit to each of the viewpoint locations coincided with early December after leaf-fall. Walking the PRoWs, of N53/7, and parts of N45/18 and N45/19, assisted in my understanding of sequential views of the site and the wider landscape. I have based my consideration of visual effects at the 15-year point following anticipated mitigating planting measures have been installed. Undoubtedly, until planting matures to an acceptable extent, there would be greater adverse effects due to the visibility of the proposed development.
30. Manston Road is a B classified road with streetlights and a footway along the side of the highway which is opposite to the site. Roadside planting of hedging largely limits views into, and through, the site apart from at the existing field entrance gate. As such, motorists would experience only a brief glimpse of the site. Passing pedestrians and cyclists would take in longer views, both at the entrance and in gaps through the hedging. Views at the entrance to the site (VP1a) provide an open and uninterrupted view of a wide panorama, taking in both the site itself and its wider context, looking out towards Hambleton Hill.
31. The indicative plan of the proposed scheme shows the retention of most of the frontage hedging, allowing for some clearance around the main access and to create the private access on the northern corner of the site. As a result, views from Manston Road (such as VP1 and 2) for pedestrians would be largely unchanged. Illustrative Cross Sections⁴ demonstrate that due to the slope, the hedging would screen most development from pedestrian eye level along Manston Road, with only the roofs of housing closest to the highway being visible. The only exception to this would be at the proposed entrance points where receptors would see a substantial magnitude of change, consisting of both buildings and roads. Nonetheless, these views would be localised only and would take in only parts of the scheme, resulting in a moderate harmful visual effect.

⁴ Drawing No 210406 SK 240809, LVIA (appendix

32. Views from the two PRoWs on the opposite side of Chivrick's Brook are noted at VPs 3, 4 and 5. Views from N45/19 (VP3 and 4) represent a receptor's view of the site from the east. In topographical terms the PRoW is higher than the brook. Whilst existing field boundary screening provides several layers of screening some views would take in large parts of the sloping appeal site and its neighbouring landform. Views from VP4 of the site, when approaching the site and entering the field that leads to the brook, are largely open and unscreened. Equally, views of the site from entering this field at VP5 would also take in views of the site with limited screening.
33. However, the indicative layout plan includes a reduction in the number of dwellings and the introduction of additional linear planting through the site. The effect of these changes would be to diffuse views of the housing and soften views. As such, whilst the magnitude of change in these views would be significant the indicative planting and layout shows a design approach that would reduce the visual impact to minor adverse only.
34. The Trailway is some distance to the south of the site. At VPs 6, 6a and 6b, the site and its adjacent fields can be seen in relatively filtered views, where the site is a small part of a far wider view. Due to the separation distance, a number of planted field boundaries and tree groups provide screening, that in combination with the distance would create only a minor adverse visual impact.
35. The PRoW that connects Manston Road with Chivrick's Brook would cross the southern edge of the site. Users of the route would experience an immediate landscape that would be largely dominated by new buildings, roadways and associated equipment. However, the retention of the existing hedge through the site, and the proposed addition planting, would prevent many views of the proposed development across the total site. Furthermore, the proposed development has been shown on the indicative plan to be set away from the pathway by a significant distance, diminishing its visual impact. Whilst the proposed pumping station is indicatively shown as being adjacent to the path, the overall effect of development on users of the PRoW would be moderate rather than major adverse.
36. Furthermore, views from Hambleton Hill (VP8) are panoramic and the site, being around 4.8kms away, would represent a small part of the view from this vantage. Therefore, due to distance and various intervening landscape screening, the effect on this view would be negligible.

Summary of character and appearance

37. In summary, the appeal site is accessible by the public with a PRoW crossing the site. Also, this connects to further PRoWs into the further countryside, which appear to be well-used recreational routes. The site is also visible from Manston Road and to a lesser extent the Trailway as an undeveloped area of green space. Overall, due to the combination of landform, existing screening, the ability to separate proposed housing on the site with areas of green space and landscape mitigation, the identified moderate adverse visual effects would be localised only and not therefore cause a significant adverse visual effect.
38. In contrast, the proposal would develop a site in a countryside setting, beyond the defined edge of the settlement. It would intrude into a wide sloping section of land. This range of fields, on the eastern side of Sturminster Newton,

collectively positively contribute towards the character of the area. The proposed development would conflict with the established character assessment of the area finding the site to be an intrusion of built form that would erode the eastern edge of the settlement, intruding into the valley. As a result, the proposal would cause significant landscape harm, eroding the character of the Rixon and Eastern Fringe character area that mitigation would be unable to address.

39. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with LP Policies 4, 19 and 24, NP policy 7 and the Framework. These seek, among other matters, for development to improve the character and quality of an area, to prevent development on green field sites outside the settlement boundary and to be sympathetic to local character. In contrast, as I have found that the visual impact of the proposal would be moderate only, this would not present a clear reason to refuse the proposal on visual amenity grounds. As a result, I find that the proposal would comply with NP policy 2 which seeks to refuse development that would affect views along the main approach roads and the routes identified in maps 3 and 9.

Other Matters

Effect on Heritage assets

40. The grade I listed building and Scheduled Monument of Fiddleford Manor and Mill House and the grade II listed building of Fiddleford Mill are approximately 1km to the southeast of the site. The Scheduled Monument of Hambleton Hill is around 5km to the southeast of the site.
41. The significance of Fiddleford Manor and Mill House appears to derive from their architectural interest, including buildings with communal value, including the remains of Fiddleford Mill. The significance of the Scheduled Monument of Fiddleford Manor includes its setting that encompasses the river Stour to the west, but this does not extend to Chivrick's Brook or its floodplain. Due to intervening plant screening the spatial and functional relationship between the site and these heritage assets would be limited. As a result, the proposal would have a negligible effect on the setting of Fiddleford Manor, Mill House and Fiddlefield Mill, preserving the significance of these assets.
42. Hambleton Hill's significance derives from its importance as one of a collection of significant hillforts in Dorset. It would be sensitive to changes to contributory elements of its setting causing visual impacts that may affect its commanding views and changes to the character of the surrounding landscape. Nonetheless, whilst visible from the hillfort the proposal would not adversely affect its setting. The proposed development would not impede the understanding of the monument's topographical importance and would not affect its relationship with other local hillforts, thus preserving its significance.

Revised Framework

43. Paragraph 78 of the new Framework states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against its housing requirement set out against its local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old. It also states that the supply should also include a buffer of 5% to ensure choice and competition. The appellant asserts that

the effect of this is to reduce the Council's 5-year supply of housing to 2.66 years. The need for additional housing is clearly a matter of national importance and this matter provides further support towards the proposal. Nonetheless, paragraph 233 of the Framework is clear that where a local planning authority has confirmed its housing land supply position through an Annual Position Statement, the position will stand until the statement expires.

Planning balance and conclusion

44. The proposal is in conflict with the development plan in respect of the overall housing strategy, and effects on character and appearance. This results in conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole.
45. The Framework seeks to boost the supply of housing and has a strong pro-growth agenda. The proposal would provide for the delivery of 50 new dwellings. The infrastructure improvements delivered through the signed S106 are required to meet policy objectives and therefore cannot be deemed as a benefit. Nonetheless, the delivery of 40% affordable housing, amounting to 20 new homes, would be deemed to be a direct benefit of the scheme. It has been identified by the appellant that there is an unmet need for new affordable homes in Sturminster Newton and this would be partly addressed by the proposal. As such, the provision of housing, including 40% being as affordable homes, would be benefits of significant weight in favour of the development.
46. The proposal would also deliver economic benefits through the creation of construction jobs and post construction through future occupiers spending in the local area. However, this gain would be delivered on any housing site and therefore this provides only moderate weight in support of the proposed development.
47. The appellant asserts that the proposal would deliver mitigation and enhancement measures within the design⁵. These include the retention of existing landscape features, providing new open space to provide panoramic views and the provision of a roadway that would follow the contours of the slope and preserve wide views. However, as the layout plan is indicative there is no certainty that the final layout of housing would provide these stated benefits. As such, the stated design benefits of the proposal's layout, and the distribution of planting, provides limited weight in favour of the proposal.
48. The appeal site adjoins the eastern boundary of the settlement. The proposal would be within close walking distance of bus stops along Manston Road and Rixon Recreational Ground. It would also be within 800 metres of a convenience food store and 1.2kms of the town centre, GP services, schools and a leisure centre. Future occupiers would therefore have relatively easy access to a range of goods and services which could be sought by sustainable travel means. However, as the site slopes downhill from Manston Road, by around 20 metres, some future occupiers may be discouraged to leave the site by foot or cycle based on the topography of the land, reducing the accessibility of the site by sustainable means. Consequently, the accessibility of the site would weigh in a modest extent in favour of the proposal.

⁵ Statement of Case, Grassroots Planning, August 2024, paragraph 4.89

49. The proposal would result in the development of poor-quality agricultural land which is favoured by the Framework over best and most versatile agricultural land, attracting a minor benefit in support of the scheme.
50. The proposal would deliver biodiversity benefits through the provision of new planting. These new areas of grassland, and tree and hedgerow planting, would deliver an 11% gain in habitats, 80% uplift in hedgerows and 30% gain in riparian habitats. This gain, which exceeds the requirements for a 10% biodiversity net gain, weighs in support of the proposal.
51. Nevertheless, the Framework places substantial importance on a plan-led spatial housing strategy and has a core principle of achieving sustainable development. In this case, locally-prepared plans demonstrate where suitable housing should be located in relation to both the district and specifically within Sturminster Newton. The Council is effectively delivering the housing objectives of the plan, and this is clearly demonstrated through its APS and HDT results, showing it is currently meeting its 5-year HLS requirements, albeit on a borderline basis.
52. Furthermore, the Framework seeks development to be “*sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting*”. The proposal would result in the encroachment of built form into an open part of the countryside that is associated with adjacent parcels of land that create a connected series of fields along the embankment that defines the edge of the town. The appeal site would not form a ‘natural’ extension to the settlement and would, for this reason, erode the landscape character of the area. As such, the adverse harm found to the landscape character of the area therefore weighs substantially against the appeal being allowed.
53. Paragraph 11(d), of the Framework, states that where policies in the development plan are out-of-date permission should be granted unless the Framework provides clear policies provide a clear reason to refuse development or any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole. Policies may be deemed out of date for a number of reasons.
54. The effect on the weight to ascribe policies was considered in two appeal decisions, in other parts of the country, submitted in evidence for Bloxham Road⁶ (Banbury) and in Sholden⁷ (Kent). As such, spatial housing policies can be rendered out-of-date if a development plan’s underlying evidence, for housing requirement, has materially changed since the plan was adopted.
55. As noted above, since publication of the revised Framework and guidance, the appellant asserts that as the Council’s housing requirement, in the former North Dorset area, has increased beyond that set out in the APS. Consequently, they say that, irrespective of the APS, the policies most relevant to the case should be deemed out-of-date, and ascribed limited weight.
56. It may be that upon expiration of the APS, a very substantial shortfall in housing supply measured against the latest requirement may arise. It may not

⁶ Planning Appeal Decision: APP/C3105/W/24/3339370

⁷ Planning Appeal Decision: APP/X2220/W/18/3213086

be possible to meet the requirement at that time within the policy Framework of the LP, and the Council may need to look to locations such as Sturminster Newton to assist in meeting housing needs in the most sustainable way. However, I am unable to reliably forecast the Council's land supply position upon expiry of the APS and, the appeal must be determined on the situation as it stands today.

57. In this case, the benefits, while important, are of limited weight, given that the Council is delivering sufficient housing to meet its needs at the present time. Conversely, the landscape harm would be permanent and irreversible and so of significantly and demonstrably greater weight. Therefore, even if the policies most relevant to the proposal, were deemed out-of-date, and the balance outlined at Framework 11(d) were considered, the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, of the scheme. The Framework, which the development plan is broadly consistent in respect of the key issues in this case would not, therefore, weigh in favour of the development.
58. The proposal is in conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations have not been shown to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it.
59. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Satnam Choongh, No5 Barrister's Chambers

Alan Williams, Grassroots Planning

Oliver Ansell, Grassroots Planning

Wendy Lancaster, Tyler Grange landscape

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Rob McDonald, Dorset Council, Lead Project Officer

Sara Hardy, Dorset Council, Senior Planning Officer

Clare Lynch, Dorset Council, Senior Planning Policy Officer

Colm O'Kelly, Dorset Council, Senior Landscape Architect

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Courtenay Hitchcock, Manston Road Residents' Association

Cllr Andrew Donaldson, Chair of Sturminster Newton Planning Committee

Cllr Pauline Batstone, Sturminster Newton Town Council