



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by **C Rose BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/25/3369687

15 Dillons Gardens, Lytchett Matravers, Dorset BH16 6DW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Edgewater Homes Ltd against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/FUL/2022/05152.
 - The development proposed is demolish existing dwelling and erect 6no 4-bedroom detached houses with associated parking and access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to demolish existing dwelling and erect 6no 4-bedroom detached houses with associated parking and access at 15 Dillons Gardens, Lytchett Matravers, Dorset BH16 6DW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/FUL/2022/05152, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal has been accompanied by a signed agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the legal agreement) securing a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing. The Council have confirmed that the legal agreement overcomes reason for refusal number 4, and as I have no reason to disagree, I do not need to deal with this as a main issue.
3. During the course of the appeal the Council clarified that reference to Purbeck Local Plan (2018 – 2024) (LP) Policy H12 in its first reason for refusal is not directly relevant to the proposal and that LP Policy E12, particularly criteria a. and h. should have been referenced. The appellant has had an opportunity to comment on this, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.
4. The appeal site falls within the catchment of the Dorset Heathland Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site and Poole Harbour Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site. Although the Council has raised no concerns with regard to this matter, as the competent authority in relation to this appeal, I am required to consider this matter and the related duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). As a result, I will deal with this as a main issue.
5. Last year the Secretary of State agreed the Council's 5-year Housing Land Supply position through an Annual Position Statement (APS), with a base date of April 2024. The Inspector's report, published in October 2024, has confirmed that the Council can demonstrate a 5.02 year HLS position until 31 October 2025. This is up

to date, independent confirmation of the housing land supply and carries 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.

Main Issues

6. In light of the above, the main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
- the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the layout and number of dwellings;
 - highway safety with particular regard to the provision of car parking spaces;
 - flood risk with particular regard to surface water drainage; and,
 - the integrity of the Dorset Heathland Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site and Poole Harbour Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site (the Protected Sites).

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling within a large plot. The site falls considerably from west to east and is accessed off Dillons Gardens. Dillons Gardens is generally characterised by suburban detached bungalows set back from the road. However, at the bottom of Dillons Gardens, adjacent to the appeal site, is a newer development of dwellings comprising Fairview. This is viewed as an extension to Dillons Gardens with its access road continuing off the turning head at the bottom of the road.
8. The access to the proposed development would utilise the existing access point off the bottom of Dillons Gardens adjacent to the access to Fairview. Although there would be a new access road serving the proposed dwellings that would run alongside the access road to Fairview, the two accesses would be separated by planting such that visually it would not appear too dissimilar to the existing arrangement. Although the new development may appear as a separate group off Dillons Gardens, this would mirror the Fairview development that is accessed off a pillared private drive and comprises houses of different designs to the bungalows fronting Dillons Gardens.
9. Proposed Units 1 and 2 would continue the existing building line at the bottom of Dillons Gardens, with the proposal comprising dwellings in reasonable size plots of a density not too dissimilar to Fairview. In light of this, and with the properties in Fairview, and Long View to the south, also having limited front outdoor space and being of a different design, materials and height to the bungalows in Dillons Gardens, the development will not appear cramped or out of character. Furthermore, the proposed development would use the topography of the site, provide new landscaping, tree planting and biodiversity enhancement with adequate outdoor space for refuse storage, and I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to demonstrate that there would be no demand for 4-bedroom properties.

10. Moreover, I note that the site falls within the Neo-Vernacular style housing character area as identified within the Purbeck Townscape Character Appraisal for Lytchett Matravers (the Appraisal). The characteristics of the area include a tight urban grain, two-storey heights, use of gables, chimneys, porches in a neo-Georgian and Victorian style. The proposed development incorporates many of these characteristics and features and as a result, the proposed development would integrate effectively with its surroundings.
11. It follows from the above that I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the layout and number of dwellings. As such, it complies with LP Policy E12 and Policy 2 of the Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan to 2031 'Made' (adopted) June 2017 (NP). Amongst other things, these expect development to demonstrate a high quality design that positively integrates with their surroundings and supports the efficient use of land taking into account the local area's prevailing character and the requirement to deliver high quality buildings and places, and where possible and appropriate, incorporate Local Design Principles.

Highway safety

12. The proposed development would provide a total of 13 car parking spaces. These would comprise 12 allocated spaces (2 per dwelling) and one visitor space.
13. LP Policy I2 states that proposals for development will be permitted where they provide for adequate parking levels across Purbeck. The policy is supported by Dorset Council's 'Residential Car Parking Provision: Local Guidance for Dorset' 2011 (the Parking Guidance). This requires that the proposal should demonstrate 12 allocated spaces, 1.8 unallocated spaces and 2.4 visitor spaces. A total of 16 spaces (rounded down). As such, the proposal has a shortfall of 3 spaces against this requirement.
14. However, paragraph 3.2.1 of the Parking Guidance states that it provides the optimum level of car parking and that where a developer wishes to provide a different level of parking, they will need to provide evidence and agree the variation with both Highways Development Control Engineers and with Planning Officers. In this regard, it is noteworthy that Dorset Highway Authority raised no objection to the proposal with the Planning Officer supporting the level of car parking and finding compliance with LP Policy I2.
15. Furthermore, the appellant highlights that the appeal site is located within walking distance of the High Street that includes various pubs, shops, library, village hall, park and a medical centre. As such, the site is well located reasonably close to a range of services and facilities, even acknowledging the presence of limited bus services, that would reduce reliance upon the use of the motor vehicle. This provides adequate justification for the number of parking spaces, and reduced visitor parking numbers, to that identified in the Parking Guidance.
16. With regard to the Council's concerns that the parking layout is contrived, this mainly relates to the provision of some tandem parking arrangements. However, these concerns are not supported by any referenced policy or guidance and are commonplace throughout housing developments. Moreover, I have not been provided with substantive evidence that this would lead to levels of parking to Dillons Gardens that would cause highway safety concerns, or restrict access for emergency vehicles, if such parking were to occur.

17. It follows from the above that the proposal would not give rise to highway safety concerns with particular regard to the provision of parking spaces. As such, it complies with LP Policy I2, the aims of which I have outlined above.

Flood risk

18. The proposed dwellings would require a revised drainage system to deal with increased surface water run-off. Foul drainage would be disposed of as existing to the sewer network.
19. The Council refused the development partly on the grounds that insufficient information has been provided to adequately demonstrate how surface water drainage would be dealt with. Documents submitted with the appeal show that the proposed surface water drainage would require the replacement of underground pipework that runs through the site. In addition, it would involve the replacement of pipework that the appellant states run across neighbouring land in different ownership before discharging to a nearby watercourse to the east of the site. The Lead Local Flood Authority have advised that such a system of surface water drainage disposal is acceptable subject to conditions.
20. In support of its case, the appellant has advised that they have easement rights to carry out any necessary repairs and replacement of the pipework. This is disputed by interested parties including the adjacent landowner through which the route of the drainage system is proposed to run. In this regard, I note that I have letters from solicitors representing both the appellant and neighbouring landowner in support of their positions. While I acknowledge that matters of land ownership and easement rights fall outside of my remit, I am required to ensure that the proposal would not increase the risk of flooding.
21. There are also concerns raised by the Council and interested parties regarding the submitted CCTV survey of the drains being inconclusive. In this regard, the CCTV survey identifies that the existing pipework is blocked before it reaches the site boundary with the survey abandoned at that point. The Council and interested parties state that this fails to demonstrate that the existing pipework extends across the adjoining land. Furthermore, it does not enable the identification of the exact route of any pipe outside of the site and in this regard, it is noted that the route does not fall within the red-line application site.
22. It is relevant to note that the Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy Report from CGS Civils January 2024 states that the use of soakaways and permeable paving is not a viable option given the ground conditions. In light of this, given that the site is susceptible to groundwater flooding/groundwater emergence with evidence from interested parties identifying incidences of surface water run-off flooding down Dillons Gardens, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that alternative methods of dealing with surface water drainage on site are possible should the proposed system be unachievable.
23. As a result, the proposed drainage strategy has not been fully resolved.
24. However, the appellant states that a planning condition requiring provision of the strategy would meet the tests of reasonableness and enforceability set out in the Framework and that if the proposed drainage strategy were not achievable, further permission from the Council would be required.

25. In this regard, the provision of the drainage scheme remains a possibility, and I cannot conclude that it definitely cannot be implemented or that it is more than unlikely or uncertain that it can be achieved. Given that matters related to private legal rights fall outside of my remit with the grant of permission not granting or extinguishing private rights, and with the owners of the adjacent land aware of the proposal despite the route of any pipes being outside of the red-line site, the imposition of a suitably worded Grampian condition would meet the necessary tests for a condition as outlined in paragraph 57 of the Framework. Should the proposed drainage scheme not be feasible for technical and/or ownership reasons, a new drainage scheme would be required.
26. As such, I am satisfied that a Grampian condition could be imposed upon the grant of any planning permission to ensure that the proposed surface water drainage strategy is designed in full including the route to the watercourse and submitted to and approved by the Council prior to the commencement of development. This will allow the delivery of the development if the proposed surface water drainage strategy can be implemented but prevent any development and any associated risk of flooding should it not be feasible.
27. For the reasons given above, and subject to a condition, the proposal would not result in flood risk with particular regard to surface water drainage. As such, the proposal complies with LP Policy E4, which, amongst other things, requires that adequate measures be taken to mitigate the risk of flooding.

Integrity of the Protected Sites

28. The appeal site falls within 5km of the Dorset Heathlands which comprises the Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area, Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site, Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (the Dorset Heathlands). The appeal site also falls within close proximity to the Poole Harbour Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site (PHSPA).
29. The Dorset Heathlands are designated on account of the rare and vulnerable wet and dry heathland species rich habitat which support the Southern damselfly *Coenagrion mercurial*, and heathland bird species including nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*, Dartford warbler *Sylvia undata*, and Woodlark *Lullula arborea* during the breeding season, and Hen Harrier *Circus cyaneus* and Merlin *Falco columbarius* over winter. The Dorset heathlands are also in an unfavourable condition due to poor water quality as a result of elevated nitrogen concentration.
30. The Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 Supplementary Planning Document April 2020 and Dorset Heathlands Interim Air Quality Strategy 2020-2025 Supplementary Planning Document seek to secure a financial contribution and measures towards the mitigation of any effects of development within 5km of the Dorset Heathlands on the integrity of the Dorset Heathlands.
31. The proposal would result in likely significant effects to the Dorset Heathlands by virtue of increased dwelling numbers and associated activity and recreational pressures.
32. The avoidance or mitigation of effects resulting from increased residential and nitrogen-based pollutants from development on the Dorset Heathlands would be achieved through a number of measures including targeting vehicle emissions and the provision of alternative greenspace, to redirect those who would have made

- use of the area recreationally, and via associated monitoring and management arrangements. The contributions that individual schemes are expected to make in that context are established at a strategic level, being funded by Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts. The proposed development is liable for CIL.
33. The PHSPA is designated for its international importance for rare plant species, bird species, breeding wildfowl and overwintering birds using intertidal mudflats, saltmarsh, reedbeds and wetland. The qualifying interest species include overwintering populations of shelduck *Tadorna tadorna*, pied avocet *Recurvirostra avosetta*, Icelandic-race black-tailed godwit *Limosa limosa islandica* and an overwintering assemblage of waterbirds. Also included are the breeding populations of Mediterranean gull *Larus melanocephalus*, common tern *Sterna hirundo* and Sandwich tern *Sterna sandvicensis*, and Aquatic Warbler *Acrocephalus paludicola* and Little Egret *Egretta garzetta* which are on passage. The PHSPA is also in an unfavourable condition due to poor water quality as a result of elevated nitrogen concentration.
 34. The proposal would result in likely significant effects to the PHSPA by virtue of increased dwelling numbers and associated activity and recreational pressures. In order to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the PHSPA, the proposed development must provide nitrogen mitigation.
 35. In this regard, the applicant has provided a calculation of the additional nitrogen loading which will result from the proposed development, using the calculator tool provided by Natural England. Dorset Council have reviewed the calculator submission and agree that the proposed development will result in the discharge of 102.25 kgTN/yr pre-2030 and 34.08 kgTN/yr post-2030 within the Poole Harbour catchment. I have no reason to disagree.
 36. The applicant has stated that the proposed development will deliver mitigation to achieve nitrogen neutrality by purchasing credits from Natural England via their project at the Lyscombe Farm.
 37. A pre-commencement condition is suggested by the Council for the proposed development to ensure that the correct number of credits are purchased prior to the works starting. In addition, since a water usage figure of 120L/person/day was applied whilst estimating the additional nitrogen loading from the proposed development in the calculator tool, a planning condition would need to be added to any permission to secure the higher level of water efficiency.
 38. While the best way to ensure the proposed purchase of credits would be through a planning obligation, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) does not rule out the use of a Grampian condition. However, the PPG states that this should be in exceptional circumstances. In this instance, I have agreed details of a proper calculation of the credits that need purchasing, linked to a Natural England mitigation project and site and with comments from Natural England agreeing to the mitigation. Therefore, in this instance, exceptional circumstances apply to secure the mitigation by condition.
 39. As a result of the above, subject to conditions and given that the development is liable for CIL, these provisions provide the necessary contributions and mitigation towards ecological monitoring and management arrangements, and mitigation consistent with the Council's approach. Natural England has confirmed that the

conditions and contribution are sufficient to avoid adverse impacts on the integrity of the European Sites and their features.

40. In conclusion on this matter, I am satisfied that with the proposed avoidance and mitigation measures in place, secured through conditions and the CIL Regulations, the development would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Dorset Heathland Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site and Poole Harbour Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site. The development would therefore comply with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. It would also accord with LP Policies E7, E8 and E9. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development will not lead to an adverse effect on the integrity, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects, directly or indirectly of nationally, European and internationally protected sites, and would not result in an increase in nutrient loading within the Poole Harbour catchment.

Other Considerations

41. The Council has raised no concerns regarding the location of the site for residential development or cumulative effects from additional housing in isolation or in combination with other nearby development and nearby land released in the Green Belt for housing. In light of its location within the settlement of Lytchett Matravers, reasonably close to a range of services and facilities, and given the small scale of the proposal, I have no reason to disagree. The submitted legal agreement secures the necessary contribution towards affordable housing, and I have no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the dwellings would not be affordable to purchase by some or result in a harmful mix of housing types.
42. With regard to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, I note that the Council raises no concerns in this regard subject to the imposition of conditions to secure details of landscaping, boundary treatment, Construction Method Statement, finished floor levels, obscure glazing of windows and roof lights to plots 1, 2, 5 and 6, provision of privacy screens to plots 5 and 6 and removal of permitted development rights. In light of this, and while I noted the relationships to neighbouring properties at my site visit, particularly to Long View, 5 Fairfield and Oakbrook, I am satisfied that the distances and levels, in association with conditions, ensure that the proposal will not result in harm in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, lighting, overbearing relationships or noise and disturbance. Furthermore, given that the site is already in residential use adjoined by residential properties, there will be no harm from general noise and disturbance or concerns regarding noise impact upon future users from the adjacent land and animals beyond the eastern site boundary.
43. Although a Construction Method Statement can be conditioned to minimise the impact from construction including any necessary piling, from construction traffic on the living conditions of nearby occupiers and to ensure highway safety, the method of construction and removal or interference with cables crossing the site are matters for the developer to resolve with the relevant authorities.
44. I have had regard to concerns raised by interested parties in relation to waste collection, safety at the junction of Dillons Gardens and Wareham Road and traffic congestion in the area, particularly at school drop-off and pick-up times. However, in light of the small scale of the proposal and inclusion of suitable bin collection

area and on-site parking, I do not find harm in these regards. It is noteworthy that the Council's Highway Officer came to the same conclusion in relation to these matters.

45. I acknowledge comments in relation to the serving of notice of the development upon neighbouring landowners. However, the appellant has advised that the necessary Certificate was served on Fairview Residents Association, and the plans do not show the removal of the existing pillars to Fairview. Furthermore, I have seen no substantive evidence to suggest appropriate certificates were not served properly and whilst the route of the drainage pipe lies partly outside of the site on third party land, the neighbouring owners are aware of the proposal and have commented upon it. As such, I am satisfied that they have not been prejudiced by this matter.
46. Matters related to materials, tree protection, details of a landscaping scheme, boundary treatment, control of water usage, details of finished floor levels, biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement, details of electric car charging points, and removal of permitted development rights can be secured through appropriate conditions. I have limited evidence before me of the presence of levels of bat activity on the site to justify the need for further surveys or mitigation.
47. I note the comments from interested parties and Ward Members regarding net carbon reduction, and in this regard a condition can be imposed to secure electric vehicle charging points. Otherwise, the development will need to comply with the relevant Building Regulations.

Conditions

48. A number of conditions have been suggested by the Council in the event of the appeal being allowed, which I have assessed and, where necessary, amended wording with regard to the advice provided in the PPG. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary for a condition to confirm the approved plans in the interests of certainty.
49. In accordance with my findings above, a pre-commencement condition is necessary to secure the submission and approval of the full details of the surface water drainage strategy in the interests of preventing flood risk. A pre-commencement condition is required to ensure that the strategy can be implemented before construction commences.
50. Also, in accordance with my findings above, a pre-commencement condition is necessary to ensure the purchase of the necessary credits and mitigation for development within the PHSPA, in the interests of the protection of ecology and biodiversity. For the same reason, a condition is necessary to restrict the daily use of water per person.
51. Pre-commencement conditions requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Method Statement, finished floor levels and tree protection during construction are necessary in the interests of protecting the living conditions of neighbouring residents and to protect trees in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.

52. Conditions are necessary to ensure that a detailed landscaping scheme and details of boundary treatment are submitted to, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and provided on site. These are required in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
53. Conditions are necessary to ensure that the first floor windows and roof lights in the side elevations of Units 1, 2, 5 and 6 are obscure glazed and fixed closed up to 1.7m in height in the interests of protecting the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. For the same reason, a condition is necessary to ensure the installation of privacy screens to the side elevations of the first floor balconies to Units 5 and 6.
54. A condition is necessary to ensure that the biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain is provided in accordance with the submitted details in the interests of the protection and enhancement of biodiversity.
55. Conditions are necessary to ensure that the first 10m of the access is laid out and constructed to a suitable specification, any gates are hung so as not to obstruct the highway, to secure the provision of the turning and parking spaces, and provision of visibility splays in the interests of protecting highway safety.
56. A condition is necessary to secure the provision of electric vehicle charging points in the interests of reducing carbon emissions.
57. Given the site levels and distances to boundaries/surrounding properties, it is reasonable and necessary to include conditions removing permitted development rights for extensions, garages, car ports, additional windows or other enlargements. These are necessary in the interests of protecting the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

C Rose

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos:
 - 9556/200 A Location & Block Plans
 - 9556/201 A Proposed Plans & Elevations Unit 1
 - 9556/202 A Proposed Plans & Elevations Unit 2
 - 9556/203 A Proposed Plans & Elevations Unit 3
 - 9556/204 A Proposed Plans & Elevations Unit 4
 - 9556/205 A Proposed Plans & Elevations Unit 5
 - 9556/206 A Proposed Plans & Elevations Unit 6

- 3) Prior to the commencement of development, a surface water drainage scheme in accordance with the details within the following surface water drainage documents, and including details of the route and levels of the drainage pipework on the site and across the neighbouring land to the identified water course, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - 101 revision PL1 Drainage Strategy Sheet 1 of 2 (dated 21/11/2023)
 - 102 revision PL2 Drainage Strategy Sheet 2 of 2 (dated 18/01/2024)
 - Proposed Drainage Strategy within Sections 5 and also Section 6 (Summary and Conclusions) within the Foul and Surface Water Drainage Report ref: C2667 revision P2 (dated 18/01/2024)
 - Maintenance Schedule within Appendix G of the Foul and Surface Water Drainage Report ref: C2667 revision P2 (dated 18/01/2024).

Thereafter, the approved scheme shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) Before the development hereby approved commences, a Construction Method Statement (CMS) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The CMS must include:
 - (a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors,
 - (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials,
 - (c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development, and
 - (d) delivery and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.
- 5) No development shall commence until the necessary nutrient mitigation credits to mitigate the impacts of the development on the Poole Harbour Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites have been secured from Lyscombe Farm or another accredited nutrient provider and a copy of the Nutrient Credit Certificate demonstrating that purchase, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 6) Prior to commencement of development, details of the finished floor levels of the dwellings hereby approved shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the agreed finished floor levels shall be constructed as approved.
- 7) Other than for the erection of tree protection, before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site, a pre-commencement site meeting between the Tree Officer, Arboricultural Consultant and Site Manager shall take place to confirm the methods of protecting trees on and adjacent to the site during development in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement within Appendix B of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment ref: 326/AIA/2 (produced by Richard Nicolson, dated 08/11/2022) and the Tree Protection Plan ref: RNapc/326/TPP/2 (produced by Richard Nicolson, dated 11/08/2022). The approved tree protection shall be positioned as shown on the Tree Protection Plan, ref: RNapc/326/TPP/2 before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development. The tree protection shall be retained until the development is completed and nothing shall be placed within the fencing, nor shall any ground levels be altered or excavations made without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

- 8) Prior to development above damp-proof course level, details and samples of all external facing materials for the walls and roofs shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with such materials as have been approved.
- 9) Notwithstanding the submitted landscaping details, no development above damp course level shall be carried out until a detailed Landscaping Scheme (to include how the vegetation to the north of the proposed access will be maintained and by whom) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full during the first planting season following commencement of the development or within a timescale to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include provision for the maintenance and replacement as necessary of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 5 years.
- 10) Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, above damp course level, details of all proposed means of enclosure, boundary walls and fences to the site, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in full accordance with the approved details.
- 11) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, the first floor windows and roof lights in the side elevations of the dwellings at plots 1, 2, 5 and 6, shall be obscure glazed to a minimum industry standard privacy level 5 or equivalent and fixed closed up to a height of 1.7 metres above the floor level of the rooms served with any opening parts more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the windows are installed; and these windows and roof lights shall be retained as such thereafter.
- 12) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, a 1.8 metre privacy screen shall be installed to the full length of the side elevations of the first floor balconies to the dwellings at Units 5 and 6 and shall be retained thereafter.
- 13) The detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain strategy set out within the approved Biodiversity Plan certified by the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team on 14/12/2022 must be implemented in accordance with any specified timetable and completed in full (including photographic evidence of compliance being submitted to the Local Planning Authority in accordance with section J of the Biodiversity Plan), prior to the occupation of the first dwelling hereby approved. The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the approved details and the mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain measures shall be permanently maintained and retained.
- 14) Before the development is occupied or utilised, the first 10 metres of the vehicle access, measured from the rear edge of the highway excluding the vehicle crossing, must be laid out and constructed to a specification submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 15) Before the development hereby approved is occupied, the turning/manoeuvring and parking shown on Drawing Number 9556/200 A must have been constructed. Thereafter, these areas, must be permanently

- maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.
- 16) Before the development hereby approved is occupied, the visibility splay areas as shown on the submitted plans must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.6 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. The splay areas must thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstructions.
 - 17) The development hereby permitted must not be occupied or utilised until the precise technical details of the electric vehicle charging points and parking bays shown on Drawing Number 9556/200 A are submitted to the Planning Authority. These details require approval to be obtained in writing from the Planning Authority. The approved scheme must be constructed before the development is occupied or utilised and, thereafter, must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.
 - 18) Details of measures to limit the potential consumption of wholesome water use by persons occupying the new dwellings to 120 litres per person per day as measured in accordance with regulation 36 of the Approved Document for Part G2 of the Building Regulations 2010 (or any equivalent regulation revoking and/or re-enacting that Statutory Instrument) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the dwelling is occupied. The submitted details shall include a water consumption calculation for the dwelling in accordance with the Approved Documents referred to above. The approved measures shall be implemented before first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority thereafter.
 - 19) There must be no gates hung so as to form obstruction to the vehicular access serving the site.
 - 20) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) or any subsequent re-enactment thereof: no extension to the dwellings, nor any garages or car ports shall be erected without express planning permission first being obtained.
 - 21) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification, no additional windows or other openings permitted by Class A of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the 2015 Order (as amended) shall be constructed in the side or rear elevations of the dwellings hereby approved.
 - 22) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification no enlargements or alterations to the dwellinghouses hereby approved under Classes A, AA, B and/or C of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended), shall be erected or constructed.

END OF SCHEDULE