

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 January 2024 18:30
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Knoll House Hotel App Ref: P/FUL/2022/06840
Attachments: T475_01b-A3 Existing Parking Layout A.pdf

Hi Ursula,

Please see comments, below, in red on the matters raised.

We also discussed the principles around a C1 only use. I would welcome this being put to the Council's solicitor and members being made aware that it would be legitimate to impose such a condition on any planning permission, should they be minded to approve planning permission or if they consider that such a condition would make the development acceptable in planning terms. In my opinion, I do not see any barrier to doing so in the context of the description of development. The commentary at p44 of the OR also seems to recognise that such a change is possible. In the context of the Appropriate Assessment, much of the consideration and conclusion appears to directly relate to the C3 Use Class and, whilst the sHRA reaches an alternative conclusion, if it was controlled to a C1 use it seems that there is some prospect that an alternative conclusion could be reached, on this matter. At the very least, this could narrow the scope of issues which are informing the reasons for refusal.

Will there be an update to members in respect of any of the other matters raised?

I will revert to you asap tomorrow in respect of both the drainage and Biodiversity Plan.

Kind regards
Ben

From: Ursula Fay [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 January 2024 14:30
To: Ben Read [REDACTED]
Cc: Elisabeth Lucas [REDACTED] Anna Lee [REDACTED] Kim Cowell [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Knoll House Hotel App Ref: P/FUL/2022/06840

Dear Ben,

Thank you for your email and letter.

It would be helpful if you could clarify the following as Members will no doubt have questions about these topics.

With regard to economic benefits in comparison to the previous proposal at this site, how is it that net additional impacts on the local economy have increased, while gross direct impacts have remained unaltered? Do you have any updated figures taking into account the amended proposals which removed 4 apartments? **We have now discussed this and clarified that we were referring to two different areas of the report. You will draw members to P40 of the OR and confirm that the figures at P55 are incorrect.**

In relation to parking, I will highlight to Members that you have identified additional capacity on the site since the previous application. This is likely to lead to questions regarding parking so could you point me in the direction of the plan showing how the existing car parking provision has been calculated as referenced at para. 2.21? I cannot see it in the Appendixes. **I have attached a copy of the plan which was prepared in respect of the first application by**

the Highways Consultants. When the revised scheme was prepared a further study of the site indicated space for a further 7 vehicles as annotated on the plan.

Regarding the submitted drainage information, I have checked with the LLFA and this does not remove their objection to the proposal. **Our drainage consultant has made contact with the LLFA. If the information is acceptable to them, will you be agreeable to removing the reason for refusal? Similarly, will you be agreeable to removing the reason relating to the Biodiversity Plan, if the details provided are acceptable to the NET?**

Many thanks,
Ursula

Ursula Fay
Lead Project Officer
Economic Growth and Infrastructure
Dorset Council


dorsetcouncil.gov.uk



From: Ben Read 
Sent: Sunday, January 7, 2024 7:04 PM
To: Ursula Fay 
Cc: Elisabeth Lucas  Anna Lee  Kim Cowell 
Subject: Knoll House Hotel App Ref: P/FUL/2022/06840

Hi Ursula,

Thank you for your email about the recent NET comments, and comments on the subsequent BP submitted. The applicant's ecologist is speaking with NET directly with the aim of trying to resolve it before committee, in spite being raised for the first time at the 11th (I would say nearly 12th) hour!

In addition, please find attached a copy of a letter prepared setting out a number of errors in the Officer Report to committee. Some are more substantive than others, but they do warrant an update to members and the Report itself to ensure that the Committee are not being misguided on what is before them. I have copied in Kim and Anna, because I spoke with Kim before Christmas to plead our case to defer the application and also left a message with Anna to the same effect. The letter re-affirms the request to defer the presentation of the application to members. There are a number of resolvable issues which have been raised at a very late stage and the OR recognises that you have not considered any of our submissions since the beginning of December, despite a number of consultee comments being received for the first time since then which go to the heart of reasons identified for refusing planning permission. This is a complicated site, the application has been with the LPA for over a year and a number of the factual errors set out are also relevant to predicating the AA on erroneous inputs – matters which I think reasonably direct that it should be deferred.

Notwithstanding the above, there are a few key issues in the letter, which I draw to your attention:

- The revised Drainage Strategy (attached) was requested by both Natural England and the National Trust. The applicant sought to accommodate these in the interests of good practice and a co-operative approach. The LLFA had previously (as part of the first application) raised no objection in respect of a drainage strategy

which discharged surface water to a watercourse west of the site. This would discharge towards Littlesea, but the site does already in an unregulated manner. The proposal, irrespective of the direction of the outfall, would result in betterment in terms of water quality compared to the current situation. This a material issue for both the planning application and AA;

- The commentary regarding the applicant declining to engage on a C1 only scheme is inaccurate. I have previously requested that the LPA consider this;
- The commentary relating to control over dogs in the accommodation on site, refers to difficulty over enforcement (but does concede that centrally managed proposals could implement it), but does this refer to an absolute control (i.e no dogs at all)? This would be relatively straight forward to manage;
- A number of benefits of the scheme pertaining to economic forecasts and trip generation (air quality) reductions do not reflect the current proposal – I think they may have been extracted from the OR relating to the previous scheme. The trip generation and therefore air quality commentary is material to both the planning application and the AA; and
- The OR does not consider highly relevant elements of the emerging LP, including Policy E8. Irrespective of the weight you give, and I do think that the analysis of paragraph 48 of the NPPF directs that an emerging Plan which has been subject to examination, initial findings of the Inspector and two subsequent Main Modifications Consultations should be afforded substantial weight. It has reached a very advanced stage, as directed by the PPG.

In conjunction with the drainage commentary I also attached the update Strategy and FRA (FRA via this link: <https://we.tl/t-3jnss3oaeY>).

Please let me know if you would like to discuss any of the issues raised – I would welcome it in the interests of narrowing the issues and ensuring that the information presented to members reflects what is proposed. I would also be grateful if you can confirm receipt of this email.

Kind regards
Ben

Ben Read MRTPI
Director
Black Box Planning Ltd

W: www.blackboxplanning.co.uk

[Follow us on LinkedIn](#)

Bristol Office: 36 King Street, Bristol, BS1 4DZ
Exeter Office: 72 Paris Street, Exeter, EX1 2JY
London Office: United House, North Road, London N7 9DP
Company No: 11444297

 Consider our environment...please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

E-Mail Disclaimer - The information in this email (and attachments) is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee and access by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient please notify us immediately and then delete this email. Any disclosure, copying, distribution of this email (and attachments), or any action taken in reliance on it, is prohibited. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete or contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message which arise as a result of email transmission. If verification is required please request a hard copy version

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. It may contain unclassified but sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or

use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the sender specifies and with authority, states them to be the views of Dorset Council. Dorset Council does not accept service of documents by fax or other electronic means. Virus checking: Whilst all reasonable steps have been taken to ensure that this electronic communication and its attachments whether encoded, encrypted or otherwise supplied are free from computer viruses, Dorset Council accepts no liability in respect of any loss, cost, damage or expense suffered as a result of accessing this message or any of its attachments. For information on how Dorset Council processes your information, please see www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/data-protection