

**Development Control Committee**  
**3 January 2024**

**WORKING PAPER 1**

**Planning Application DC/23/0133/FUL – Land off  
Fordham Road, Freckenham**

**Date registered:** 17 March 2023

**Expiry date:** 16 June 2023  
EOT 5 January 2024

**Case officer:** Amey Yuill

**Recommendation:** Refuse application

**Parish:** Freckenham

**Ward:** Manor

**Proposal:** Planning application - change of use of agricultural land to enclosed field for dog training and exercising and associated access and parking

**Site:** Land off Fordham Road, Freckenham

**Applicant:** Messrs Cannam, Cross and Whitehead

**Synopsis:**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

**CONTACT CASE OFFICER:**

Amey Yuill

Email: [amey.yuill@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:amey.yuill@westsuffolk.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01284 763233

## **Background:**

**This application was referred to the Delegation Panel due to Freckenham Parish Council supporting the proposal via a letter of support submitted with the application, contrary to the officer's recommendation of REFUSAL. In addition, comments of support were received from Councillor David Taylor (Manor Ward Member).**

**Following the Delegation Panel meeting on 7 November 2023, it was concluded that the application should be determined by the Development Control Committee.**

**During the course of the application two consultations have taken place with statutory consultees and neighbouring properties due to a number of amendments being received, including alterations to the site layout and the addition of landscaping to the site.**

**A site visit is scheduled to take place on Tuesday 2 January 2024.**

## **Proposal:**

1. The proposal is for the change of use of agricultural land to an enclosed field for dog training and exercising, including a 1.8 metre boundary fence, associated access from Fordham Road, parking, and landscaping.
2. The initial proposal was for a larger parking area to the front of the site, as well as fencing close to the road and no soft landscaping. Following concerns being raised by the case officer with the applicant, a revised scheme was submitted which has reduced the parking to the front of the site, removed the fencing close to the highway and soft landscaping is now proposed to the south, west and northern boundaries of the application site.

## **Application supporting material:**

3. In support of this advertisement consent application, the following has been provided:
  - Application Form
  - Location Plan (drawing no. 22:123-1)
  - Proposed Site Layout (drawing no. 22:123-2 A)
  - Proposed Elevations (drawing no. 22:123-3)
  - Soft Landscaping Plan 1 (drawing no. 23/175-01)
  - Soft Landscaping Plan 2 (drawing no. 23/175-02)
  - Vehicle Tracking Alignments Plan – Forward Bay Parking (drawing no. 304/2023/02 P1)
  - Vehicle Tracking Alignments Plan – Reverse Bay Parking (drawing no. 304/2023/03 P1)
  - Fence Specifications
  - Statement
  - SUDs Proforma
  - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
  - Parking Details

## Site details:

- The application site currently comprises an arable agricultural field outside the settlement boundary of Freckenham, on land designated as countryside for the purpose of planning. The site is bounded by agricultural land to the north, east and west, with Fordham Road bounding the site to the south. The settlement of Freckenham lies further to the east, approximately 100 metres from the application site.

## Planning history:

5.

Reference	Proposal	Status	Decision date
DC/20/1500/EIASC O	Request for Scoping Opinion under Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 - 55 kilometre potable water pipeline between Bexwell and Bury St Edmunds together with associated connections and above ground apparatus	EIA Screening/Scoping Opinion Issued	23 October 2020
F/99/270/ADI	Retrospective: Information hoarding advertising local public house and restaurant.	Refuse	28 July 1999

## Consultations:

- Private Sector Housing and Environmental Health** – Concerns were raised in terms of the adverse impact the proposed development could have on the amenity of residential properties close to the application site, due to noise as a result of dogs barking travelling long distances. However, subject to conditions restricting the number of dogs on the site at any one time to six, the hours of use for the site to 8am until 8pm, as well as limitations on the level of light allowed on the site, no objections were given if permission were to be granted.
- Suffolk County Council Highway Authority** – Following the submission of the revised scheme, which removed the previously proposed turning circle and reducing the parking provision by parking spaces, the Highway Authority raised a holding objection to the development until evidence could be provided that vehicles can enter and exit the highway in a forward gear and the anticipated number of users at any time to enable the accurate assessment if the parking provision provided.
- Additional information was provided in terms of the parking on site, as well as vehicles movement and manoeuvring entering and exiting the highway. Following re-consultation with the Highway Authority, it was confirmed that they were satisfied by the information submitted and raised no

objection to the granting of planning permission on highway grounds, subject to conditions requiring visibility splays to be provided in accordance with the submitted plans, that the access shall be completed prior to any other development on site being commenced, surfacing to be implemented prior to the proposed development being first used, and parking to be provided and thereafter retained and maintained.

9. **Landscape Officer** – Following the submission of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), it was advised that whilst the addition of hedging and trees proposed would benefit ecology, the proposed development should be refused, on the basis that the local landscape character would be adversely affected by the proposed change of use to a dog training field in this location, with associated car parking, access and perimeter fencing, as well as paraphernalia required for the use, i.e., poo bins.

### **Representations:**

10. **Freckenham Parish Council** – No comments received from Freckenham Parish Council during the course of the application, however, a letter of support was submitted with the planning application which was from Freckenham Parish Council.
11. **Ward Member** – Comments of support were received from Councillor Taylor (Manor Ward Member) advising “the land will not be changed in anyway and only used for dogs to run and play on, the fence is by no means an eyesore and I believe would blend in with other fencing along the road and the project would seem an excellent use of the land that will not be used for crops”.
12. **Third Party Representation** – One representation was received from Red House in Worlington raising an objection to the proposal due to concerns regarding highway safety, noise pollution, the requirement of such a facility, whether the site is within a green belt area and how the proposed development may impact other neighbouring businesses which are similar.

### **Policy:**

13. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by regulation. The development plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (which had been adopted by both councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved St Edmundsbury Borough Council.
14. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the Forest Heath Core Strategy 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:
  - Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

- Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy DM5 Development in the Countryside
- Policy DM11 Protected Species
- Policy DM12 Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity
- Policy DM13 Landscape Features
- Policy DM14 Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards
- Policy DM46 Parking Standards
- Core Strategy Policy CS1 - Spatial Strategy
- Core Strategy Policy CS2 - Natural Environment
- Core Strategy Policy CS3 - Landscape character and the historic environment
- Core Strategy Policy CS5 - Design quality and local distinctiveness
- Core Strategy Policy CS10 - Sustainable rural communities

**Other planning policy:**

15. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

16. The NPPF was revised in September 2023 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 219 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2023 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

**Officer comment:**

17. The issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Impact on Character of Area and Landscape
- Residential Amenity Impact
- Highway Safety and Parking
- Ecological Impact
- Other matters

## Principle of Development

18. This proposal is for the change of use of a Grade 2 arable agricultural field to a dog training field with new vehicular access, hardstanding for parking, perimeter 1.8m high fencing and associated refuse bins within the field.
19. The application site is located outside of any settlement boundary, within land designated as countryside for the purpose of planning, with the Freckenham settlement boundary to the east being approximately 100 metres from the application site.
20. Policy DM5 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (JDMPD) deals with development within the countryside and states areas designated as countryside will be protected from unsustainable development. This is also required by policy DM1 of the JDMPD and CS1 and CS2 of the Forest Heath Core Strategy (FHCS) which seek to secure sustainable development for all proposals. Policy CS1 recognises that Freckenham is a Secondary Village, where development outside the settlement boundary will be restricted to particular types of development that support the rural economy, meet affordable housing needs, or provide renewable energy, subject to all other material considerations and policies.
21. The application site is not accessible via foot, with no street lighting or pavements from Freckenham to the application site. Therefore, users of the dog training and walking field would exclusively be accessing the site via car. The proposed development is therefore not deemed to be sustainable in the sense of its environmental impact, due to the reliance of cars for the proposed use. However, the proposal is of a low intensity, with only two bookings and a maximum of six dogs allowed at any one time on the field, which could be reasonably controlled via condition if permission were to be granted. Furthermore, the development does provide some social and economic benefits with a new business being proposed. Therefore, on balance, the development is considered to accord with policy DM1 and DM5 of the JDMPD and CS1 and CS2 of the FHCS, in terms of the overall sustainability balance of the proposal when assessed against Policy DM5.
22. DM5 goes on to state that proposals for economic growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise that recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside will be permitted where it will not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a); there will be no significant detrimental impact on the historic environment, character and visual amenity of the landscape or nature conservation and biodiversity interests; and there will be no significant adverse impact on the local highway network.
23. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF), supports sustainable economic growth and Chapter 6, 'Building a Strong Competitive Economy', states that "planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt". Accordingly, the Forest Heath Core Strategy (FHCS) policy CS10 seeks to develop and sustain the existing economy by stating that the diversification of existing rural enterprises and the development of new enterprises where a rural location is either environmentally or

operationally justified will be supported, provided there are no significant detrimental environmental, landscape, conservation or highway impacts.

24. The site has been in agricultural use recently and is Grade 2 agricultural land, which is the best and most versatile agricultural land. The proposal will lead to its loss, in the sense that it will no longer be capable of being used for agricultural purposes. However, the use proposed is largely temporary in nature, with fencing which could be removed, thereby reverting the site back to agricultural use if needed. Nonetheless, it will be 'lost' for the duration of any consent, and this is a matter that, modestly, does weigh against the proposal in the balance of considerations, albeit not at a level that would justify a refusal, when balanced against the clear economic benefits arising and when the reversible nature of the use is also taken into account.

25. As such, the principle of development is acceptable, subject to compliance with material planning considerations.

### **Design and Impact on Character of Area and Landscape**

26. Development such as the provision of a dog training and walking field will need to be in accordance with both national and local policies relating to design and impact on the character of the area and landscape in general.

27. Para.130 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. This is supported by policy DM2 of the JDMPD and policy CS5 of the FHCS which advise that proposals for all development should, recognise and address the key features, characteristics, landscape/townscape character, local distinctiveness and special qualities of the area and/or building and should be designed to a high quality.

28. In addition, para.174 of the NPPF advises planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a. protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
- b. recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland.

29. This is endorsed by policy DM5 and DM13 of the JDPMD, as well as policy CS2 and CS3 of the FHCS, which requires developments to recognise and take into account the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, the local distinctiveness and sensitivity to change of distinctive landscape character types, protect areas of landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity interest and local distinctiveness from harm, and will only permit development which will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character of the landscape, landscape features, wildlife, or amenity value.

30. In accordance with policy CS3 of the FHCS, landscape types are described in the Forest Heath Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). The Landscape Character Assessment will inform detailed assessment of individual proposals. All schemes should protect and seek to enhance overall landscape character, taking account of the key characteristics and distinctiveness of the landscape and the landscape setting of settlements. This is further embodied in DM5, with the requirement to respect the character and visual amenity of the landscape within the countryside.
31. The site is an existing arable agricultural field set within the countryside to the north of Fordham Road. The site is beyond the limits of the village of Freckenham and separated from the Grange Farm site to the east by two narrow fields. The field is open to neighbouring fields on three sides with a drainage ditch to the front which follows the road alignment. The site is very exposed in its location, with no hedge boundaries to fields, only the occasional roadside tree, and also very open to the surrounding countryside, which is characterised by large arable fields on gently rising ground. This means that the site is visible from surrounding road networks and public rights of way in both the near and far distance due to the lack of any visual interruptions such as hedgerows or woodland.
32. The proposed new use for the site as a dog training field with new vehicular access, hardstanding for parking, perimeter 1.8m high fencing and refuse bins will represent a change in the landscape by means of its associated infrastructure. The proposal is supported by mitigation measures following concerns being raised by the case officer, which include the planting of native trees at the entrance and perimeter hedge planting of hawthorn, with the planting designed to screen and soften views to the parking area from the road, which has been set back from the highway and reduced in scale from the original submission, and also to screen the perimeter metal fencing viewed from beyond the site.
33. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been submitted in support of the application with the revised scheme. The LVIA has been carried out in line with the principles set out on the third edition of "Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment" (GLVIA3) and includes an assessment of landscape and visual receptors. Given the baseline conditions, the assessment concludes that the effects on landscape character both in landscape and visual terms is in the main, none at all. Despite valid baseline and methodology and viewpoints, the Landscape Officer consulted on the application advised that they disagree with the degree of landscape and visual effects as concluded within the LVIA.
34. The LVIA suggests there is vegetation on site to be retained, however, this is limited to grassland only. Trees and hedges are visible in the viewpoints studied; however, these are growing on the opposite side of Fordham Road and their screening to parked cars would be limited. The inclusion of proposed mitigation is however welcomed in terms of providing some screening of the parking area, fencing and paraphernalia associated with the change of use of the agricultural field and would provide long term biodiversity benefits, therefore, is an improvement on the originally submitted scheme, which proposed a larger parking area and no landscaping.



35. That being said, the Landscape Officer stated that the proposed new use for the site, with the associated car parking and vehicular use and metal perimeter fencing, possible training structures during sessions and bins, will present detracting factors in this open landscape setting. The landscape and visual effects of the proposed dog training operation are not considered to be negligible, contrary to the conclusions of the submitted LVIA. Therefore, officers have concluded that the change of use of the site would lead, overall and on balance, to an adverse impact on landscape character despite the benefits of mitigation hedge and tree planting to the perimeter and site frontage.
36. It is acknowledged that the soft landscaping scheme proposed provides some mitigation planting which will screen intrusive features such as high metal fencing, gates and car parking and will provide biodiversity and landscape benefits. However, with the existing landscape character in this area being large open rolling fields allowing extensive views across the landscape rather than small hedges, the local landscape character would remain adversely affected by the proposed development in this location.
37. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to conflict with policy DM2, DM5 and DM13 of the JDMPD, CS2, CS3 and CS5 of the FHCS and the provisions of the NPPF to a degree which would warrant the refusal of the application due to its adverse impact upon the character of the landscape character and countryside.

### **Residential Amenity Impact**

38. Policies DM2 seeks to ensure that new development does not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity, nor the amenities of the wider area. The policy states that the amenities of adjacent areas by reason of noise, smell, vibration, overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light or other pollution (including light pollution, or volume or type or vehicular activity generated), must be considered.
39. DM14 states that proposals for all new developments should minimise all emissions and other forms of pollution (including light and noise pollution) and ensure no deterioration to either air or water quality. The policy goes on to say that all applications for development where the existence of, or potential for creation of, pollution is suspected must contain sufficient information to enable the Planning Authority to make a full assessment of potential hazards.
40. Concerns have been raised by the residents of the Red House in Worlington in terms of the proposal's potential to impact their amenity as a result of noise pollution. The application site is located over 3.5km from Red House so no impact from noise pollution in terms of dog barking is anticipated, however, the application site is located approximately 90 metres from the nearest residential property to the east, therefore, careful consideration is required as to how the proposed development may impact their residential amenity from noise pollution.
41. The Environmental Health Officer was consulted on the application and advised that they do have concerns regarding the proposal's potential to impact neighbouring amenity regarding noise pollution as dog training and exercising use can include additional activities such as formal training and

/ or agility classes etc. which have the potential to have an unreasonable impact on the living amenity of occupiers of nearby residential properties arising from frequent and / or prolonged barking from excitable dogs. Furthermore, noise from barking in the open air can travel further than might ordinarily be anticipated, particularly over flat terrain, if not adequately mitigated.

42. However, with conditions limiting the maximum number of dogs on the site at any time to six, as well as limiting the hours of use of the site to between 8am until 8pm on any day, the proposed development would raise no objection from the Environmental Health Officer should the application be granted. In addition, it is considered appropriate by the case officer that if the permission were to be granted, a condition should be placed upon the permission which states that no external lighting shall be installed on the application site without prior written consent from the Local Planning Authority, in the interest of residential amenity, visual amenity and the control of light pollution in what is otherwise a rural, unlit area.
43. Therefore, in summary, the proposal is deemed to be acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity, subject to the conditions suggested, and would comply with policy DM2 and policy DM14 in that regard.

### **Highway Safety and Parking**

44. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document seeks to ensure that proposals maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network and para. 111 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
45. Furthermore, policy DM46 states that all proposals must comply with Suffolk Parking Guidance and Local Planning Authorities will seek to reduce over-reliance on the car and to promote more sustainable forms of transport.
46. The customers for the proposed dog training and walking field would rely on the use of a car to access the dog training and walking field, therefore, an associated access from Fordham Road is required, as well as an area of hardstanding for parking.
47. The original submission for the proposed change of use included eight parking spaces and a turning area to the southeastern corner of the application site. Following concerns being raised by the case officer in terms of the expanse of hardstanding which was considered to have an adverse impact upon the character of the area, a revised scheme was submitted which removed the previously proposed turning circle and reduced the parking provision down to four spaces.
48. Following the submission of the revised proposal, Suffolk County Council Highway Authority raised a holding objection to the development until evidence could be provided that vehicles could enter and exit the highway in a forward gear and the anticipated number of users at any time to enable the accurate assessment if the parking provision provided.

49. Additional information was provided in terms of the parking on site which detailed that only two owners could be booked on the site at any one time and only six dogs on site in total, as well as the vehicle movement and manoeuvring tracking entering and exiting the highway. The Highway Authority confirmed that they are satisfied by the information submitted and raised no objection to the granting of planning permission on highway grounds, subject to conditions requiring visibility splays to be provided in accordance with the submitted plans, that the access shall be completed prior to any other development on site being commenced, surfacing to be implemented prior to the proposed development being first used, and parking to be provided and thereafter retained and maintained. These conditions are considered reasonable and necessary by the case officer, should permission be granted.
50. Objections were raised by one member of the public, who raised concerns in terms of the proposal's impact upon the highway network due to increased traffic. As per para. 111 of the NPPF, development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Therefore, with only six dogs allowed on site at any time and only two owners per slot, meaning a maximum of four cars could be parked on the site and this only being during the changeover times for the booking slots, which could be controlled via condition, it is not anticipated that the proposed change of use would result in such an increase in traffic levels that it would justify the refusal of the application and SCC as Highways Authority raises no objections to the application accordingly.
51. In summary, the proposed development is deemed to comply with both national and local policy in terms of its highway safety impact and parking.

### **Ecological Impact**

52. As required by the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) within Chapter 15, LPA's have a duty to protect and enhance biodiversity when determining planning applications. At a local level, this is exhibited through policies CS2, DM11 and DM12.
53. Policy DM11 states that development will not be permitted unless suitable satisfactory measures are in place to reduce the disturbance to protected species and either maintain the population on site or provide alternative suitable habitats. Policy DM12 seeks to ensure that, where there are impacts to biodiversity, development appropriately avoids, mitigates or compensates for those impacts.
54. This development is sited on an arable agricultural field, which up until recently, has been farmed. Therefore, the proposed development is not considered to have any adverse impacts upon the biodiversity of the area and therefore is in accordance with policy DM11.
55. Ecological enhancements should be secured (as required by NPPF para 174 and DM12), which could be delivered through the proposed new tree and hedge planting, as well as further bespoke biodiversity enhancements that could reasonable be secured on any approval. It is therefore considered

reasonable and necessary, if the permission were to be granted, to condition the requirement for the soft landscaping proposed to be implemented within the first planting season and for it to thereafter be maintained.

### **Other Matters**

56. A third party objection was received from Red House during the course of the application which raised concerns in terms of noise pollution and highway impacts, which has been addressed above. In addition, the objection raised concerns in terms of whether the proposed dog training and walking field is needed, noting there are similar facilities nearby, and how this may impact those businesses, as well as querying whether the site is within a green belt area.

57. The application site is not within a green belt area and the necessity of the dog training and walking field and how this may result in competition to similar businesses nearby are not material planning considerations.

### **Conclusion:**

58. The general principle of the change of use of the land from agricultural to sui generis (dog training) is considered to be acceptable, as the use could be reversed if necessary and reused as agricultural land. The addition of hedging and trees proposed providing some ecological benefit. However, the associated fencing, parking area and paraphernalia associated with a dog training field and mitigation landscaping would lead to an unacceptable impact upon the character of the area and landscape, which is, at present, extremely open and rural. There are some economic and social benefits arising from the proposal, but these are not considered sufficient to outweigh the landscape and visual impact harm.

59. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the policies of the development plan and NPPF relating to impacts on the countryside and landscape character.

### **Recommendation:**

60. It is recommended that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. Para.130 and 174 of the NPPF state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change, as well as protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

This is endorsed by policy local policies DM2, DM5 and DM13 of the JPDO, as well as policies CS2, CS3 and CS5 of the FHCS, which require developments to recognise and address the key features, characteristics, landscape character, local distinctiveness, and special qualities of the area and for developments to take into account the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, the local distinctiveness and sensitivity to change of distinctive landscape

character types, protect areas of landscape, and local distinctiveness from harm.

The site is located in the countryside, in a very exposed location, with no hedge boundaries to fields, only the occasional roadside tree, and is open to the surrounding countryside, which is characterised by large arable fields on gently rising ground. This means that the site is highly visible from the surrounding road networks and public rights of way in both the near and far distance due to the lack of any visual interruptions such as hedgerows or woodland.

The proposed new use for the site, with the associated car parking and vehicular access and metal perimeter fencing, possible training structures during sessions and bins and the mitigating landscaping proposals in themselves, will present detracting factors in this open landscape setting. The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed dog training operation are not negligible. Therefore, it is considered that the change of use of the site would lead to an adverse impact on landscape character, despite the benefits of mitigation hedge and tree planting to the perimeter and site frontage, and to a level which would be contrary to policies DM2, DM5 and DM13 of the JDMPD, CS2, CS3 and CS5 of the FHCS and the provisions of the NPPF, to a degree which would warrant the refusal of the application, and which is not outweighed by any economic or social benefits arising.

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online [DC/23/0133/FUL](https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/online-applications/DC/23/0133/FUL)