

From: Steven Bainbridge Lone Wolf Planning

Sent: 06 September 2026 20:10

To: Wright, Georgina

Subject: Re: PL/2025/10020 VAR MAJOR Chick lade Service Station, Chick lade, SP3 5ST

Good afternoon Georgina,

Thank you for your email. I understand that we need to respond to the following, as other matters are dealt with or will soon be:

- 1. materials
- 2. landscaping
- 12. grey water harvesting
- 14. floorplan, uses and retail matters

Please note that we will provide you with an addendum to the planning statement soon, because we think it is essential to assist the LPA with the pivot to new national policy on the substantial weight to sustainable development outside of settlements, and roadside facilities in particular.

On materials, please find attached some additional information, the purpose of which is to give the LPA comfort over the applicant's approach to materials. InstaVolt and their designers and engineers have been cognisant of the approved scheme, but also the need to deliver a commercially viable scheme, not least reflecting the not-insignificant increase in the cost of building materials since the conception of the original design prior to 2022 (certain of the original application documents date back to summer 2022). InstaVolt have worked with the Estate to deliver the scheme at Chicklade, utilising their rare experience of delivering EV charging hubs/'roadside facilities' against a constantly changing and advancing technological background. InstaVolt have also been cognisant of the policy drivers, which have evolved into the recently published NPPF. Thank you for directing our attention to policy DP4:2.c. with regard to diminishing quality of materials from consent to delivery. We can assure you that InstaVolt (in consultation with the Estate) and their design team and architects have spent a significant amount of time researching commercially viable materials which still hold true to the original concept. In addition, we are mindful of the requirements of NDMP DM3 Key principles for well-designed places:

"3. Development proposals **should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph 1** of this policy **or relevant aspects of the principles in paragraph 2**, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans). Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals".

We are content that the proposals do not conflict with paragraph 1 or 2 of DM3 (our emphasis):

*"1. Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. This should **not preclude innovation or change where appropriate**, especially where an increased scale or density of development is justified in accordance with policies L2 and L3."*

and

*"2. To create well-designed places, development proposals should also reflect relevant aspects of the following principles, as **appropriate to the nature of the development and its location**:*

*b. Climate: contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation and the transition to net zero by using building layouts, building orientation, massing, landscaping and **materials which conserve** energy and **other resources**, and which minimise risks from the impacts of climate change including overheating;*

*d. Movement: **provide transport infrastructure**;*

*g. Identity: create **visually attractive**, distinctive and characterful development to establish or maintain **a strong sense of place** and pride, including through the use of **a coherent palette of materials**, design features and planting"*

We would encourage the LPA to review the attached, and we're sure we can arrange for a sample to be sent to you - where should it be sent please? Please also have a look at these websites which show the walling material in use in public facing scenarios:

<https://archello.com/project/clisson-high-school>

<https://www.cupastone.com/projects/a-charming-retirement-home/>

<https://www.cupastone.com/projects/stonepanel-and-large-supermarket-chains/>

On the wider planning balance (materials vs. other matters), we will be directing the LPA's attention to policies S5 and TR5 in particular.

On the landscaping point, we have commissioned another photomontage to show that the approach to the slope angle behind the building will be effective from the public viewpoint.

On the grey water harvesting point, I'm afraid you have us at a loss. I don't recall and can't find any reference to having said *"the requirement was not known about during initial ground works"*. What we have said is quite different:

"I have reviewed the previous documentation, and can see the Drainage Strategy Commentary letter dated 23/09/22 which states that "Uncontaminated (roof) surface water is to be collected and reused within the site". The letter goes on to state that "a network has been designed that directs flows through three paths: foul, roofs, and roads (see drawing 80636-01). The foul network is relatively simple, conveying the flow to a sewage treatment plant. The roof network passes through a rainwater harvester, and the road network through an oil interceptor, before merging together".

There is no detail provided in drawing 80636-01 or the Drainage Strategy Report dated Oct 2023 providing any detail on how this was to be achieved, short of basic statements of intent (although I can see that much reliance was placed on these statements by the LPA) - if this is incorrect, please let us know.

At this stage grey [roof] water harvesting is not proposed. It is contended that the 'sustainability' credentials of catching water off a roof, pale in comparison to the sustainability credentials of the core function of the scheme itself - EV charging infrastructure and the enhanced sustainability derived from the fact that InstaVolt intend to install more chargers that the planning conditions achieve - a requirement that has a demand on below-ground servicing not taken into account at application stage - so it is not correct to assert that its provision is not onerous. If the LPA considers that this will become a sticking point, then please let us know."

In any event, looking back over the original documentation, whilst the approved drainage layout plan revF says that rainwater is harvested and directed back to WCs, there is no other 'grey water harvesting' that we're aware of. I don't think the 'loss' of this relatively minor 'sustainability' element is sufficient to counter the significant benefits of the proposals uplift of EV charging and solar, albeit we can understand the rationale of certain consultees claiming otherwise. We see what condition 30 says, but we're struggling to see an approved grey water harvesting system beyond the collection of rainwater for toilets. We consider that what c30 talks about, vs. what was actually consented, were two different things. We remain content that the overriding sustainability credentials of this scheme lie in the provision of significant roadside facilities which support transport decarbonisation - something that NPPF NDMP S5 is very clear should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects.

On the floorplans matter (please see attached which is, for now, your eyes only), we have requested a final floorplan as per your request and it will be submitted in support of a planning statement addendum. Apologies it has not been forthcoming, but much has relied on the evolving discussions that InstaVolt have been having with Chickpea - a tenant that the Estate and the village have expressed a preference for, as opposed to other more 'obvious' and 'everyday' providers. We intend to provide you with a post-NPPF addendum to the planning statement. That document is going to direct the LPA's attention to new policy on roadside facilities, which we will contend supplants previous concerns about retail impact etc., which track back to the officer's report for the originally consented scheme - matters which were laid to bed when planning permission was granted for a significant uplift to the transport decarbonisation offer at

Chicklade Services - the prior petrol/diesel and Little Chef offer being a dinosaur of the 1960s.

We will provide the following in short order for the next/last reconsultation:

- Addendum to the Planning Statement citing new compelling NPPF policies on development outside settlements (S5) and roadside facilities (TR5) and others.
- a final floor plan.
- an additional photomontage.
- a physical sample of the wall material.

If you think that a Teams meeting would be useful prior to the reconsultation, please let us know, we remain at your disposal.

Regards,

Steven Bainbridge MRTPI

Planning Director

07548237530

[Lone Wolf Planning Ltd](#)



Company No. 15897389

Registered Office: Leanne House, 6 Avon Close, Weymouth, Dorset, England DT4 9UX