



Dorset Council Consultation Response Document:
Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications to
the Purbeck Local Plan
January 2024

Contents

Context for consultation on supplementary proposed Main Modifications	11
Consultation on Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications	15
Schedule of Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications	15
Consultation on further proposed Main Modifications	15
Who was consulted?	16
How the publication occurred	16
Responses on Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications	18
Council summary of relevant matters of issues raised through consultation relating to Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications	20
Relevant issues relating to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications	20
Issues falling outside the scope of the current consultation	22
Changes to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2023)	24
Conclusions	26
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 88: Foreword	27
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	27
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	27
Council Response	28
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 1: Chapter 1, Introduction, Paragraph 3	32
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	32
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	32
Council Response	32
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 3: Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, paragraphs 43 and 44	34
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	34
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	34
Council Response	34
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 4: Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, insert text after paragraph 44	37
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	37

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	37
Council Response	37
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 5: Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, Policy V1: Spatial strategy for sustainable communities and key diagram	40
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	40
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	40
Council Response	41
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 6: Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, paragraphs 45 to 48	43
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	43
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	44
Council Response	45
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 8: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraphs 52, 53 and 54	49
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	49
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	49
Council Response	50
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 14: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraph 81	53
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	53
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	53
Council Response	53
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 15: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraph 83 (insertions and deletions)	54
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	54
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	54
Council Response	54
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 16: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraph 85 (insertions)	57
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	57

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	57
Council Response	58
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 86: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraphs 86 to 91	61
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	61
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	62
Council Response	62
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 18: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraphs 95	66
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	66
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	66
Council Response	66
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 19: Chapter 3 Environment, Policy E7	68
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	68
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	68
Council Response	68
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 20: Chapter 3 Environment, Policy E8	71
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	71
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	71
Council Response	71
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 21: Chapter 3 Environment, Policy E9	73
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	73
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	73
Council Response	73
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 25: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 110 and 111	75
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	75

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	75
Council Response	75
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 26: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H1	77
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	77
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	77
Council Response	77
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 27: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 114	79
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	79
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	79
Council Response	79
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 28: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 116 and 117	80
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	80
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	80
Council Response	80
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 29: Chapter 4 Housing, Trajectory	82
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	82
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	82
Council Response	82
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 30: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H2	85
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	85
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	85
Council Response	85
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 31: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 118	87
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	87

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	87
Council Response	87
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 32: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H3	89
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	89
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	89
Council Response	89
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 38: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H5	91
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	91
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	92
Council Response	92
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 40: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H6	94
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	94
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	94
Council Response	95
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 42: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 148 and 149 (insertions and deletions)	97
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	97
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	97
Council Response	97
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 43: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H8	98
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	98
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	98
Council Response	98
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 46: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H10	100
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	100

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	100
Council Response	100
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 47: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H11	101
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	101
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	101
Council Response	101
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 48: Chapter 4 Housing, title before paragraph 170 (deletion)	102
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	102
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	102
Council Response	102
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 49: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 171 and 172 (alterations, insertions and deletions).....	103
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	103
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	103
Council Response	103
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 52: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H12	104
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	104
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	104
Council Response	104
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 54: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H13	106
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	106
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	106
Council Response	106
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 63: Chapter 5 Economy, Policy EE2	107
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	107

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	107
Council Response	107
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 65: Chapter 5 Economy, Policy EE3	108
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	108
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	108
Council Response	108
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 66: Chapter 5 Economy, Policy EE4	109
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	109
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	109
Council Response	109
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 68: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, paragraph 230 (insertion)	110
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	110
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	110
Council Response	110
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 76: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, paragraphs 256 and 257	111
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	111
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	111
Council Response	111
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 77: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, Policy I5	112
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	112
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	112
Council Response	112
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 87: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, paragraphs 263 to 265	114
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	114

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	114
Council Response	114
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 81: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, Policy I7	115
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	115
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound	115
Council Response	115
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 82: Chapter 7 Implementation delivery and monitoring, monitoring framework.....	116
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	116
Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound.....	116
Council Response	116
Addendum to Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) (SMMCD2)	118
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	118
Changes suggested by the respondent.....	118
Council Response	118
Inset maps for Wareham and Bere Regis	120
Summary of matters / issues raised in responses	120
Changes suggested by the respondent.....	120
Council Response	120
National Planning Policy Framework 2019	142
Delivering a sufficient supply of homes	142
Conserving and enhancing the natural environment	142
Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals	142
Glossary	142
National Planning Policy Framework 2021	144
Achieving sustainable development	144
Plan Making.....	144
Delivering a sufficient supply of homes	144
Promoting healthy and safe communicates.....	145
Promoting sustainable transport.....	145
Making Effective use of land.....	145

Achieving well-designed places.....	146
Conserving and enhancing the natural environment	147
Other matters	148
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023	150
Meeting the challenge of climate change, flood and coastal change.....	150
Other matters - Annex 1 Implementation.....	150

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Consultation response form.....	121
Appendix 2 - Notification letter for consultation on proposed Main Modifications	138
Appendix 3 – Revised National Planning Policy Framework February 2019.....	141
Appendix 4 – Revised National Planning Policy Framework July 2021	143
Appendix 5 – Revised National Planning Policy Framework September 2023.....	149

Context for consultation on supplementary proposed Main Modifications

1. This document relates to the Purbeck Local Plan (2018 – 2034). The local plan was submitted for examination by the Secretary of State on 28 January 2019. A Planning Inspector was appointed to examine the local plan and a series of public hearing sessions were held in July, August and October 2019. During the examination (prior to any further consultations) the Inspector recommended Main Modifications to the local plan to resolve soundness and legal compliance issues that had been raised through the examination.
2. The council received a Post Hearing Note¹ from the Planning Inspector in March 2020 following the last hearing session in 2019. The Inspector's note sets out a series of changes, and a schedule of suggested Main Modifications (SD14) considered necessary to make the Plan sound and legally compliant. Taking account of the Inspector's note the council opened a consultation on proposed Main Modifications to the Purbeck Local Plan on 13 November 2020 which closed early in the following year on 8 January 2021.
3. The council received a total of 40 responses to the proposed Main Modifications. The representations raised matters/issues relating to each of the 85 proposed Main Modifications. The council has published these representations in full and prepared a consultation response document which summarises the matters/issues that were raised, any steps which the respondent considered were necessary to make the local plan sound/legally compliant and the council's response.
4. The council did not find that any of the responses raised substantive issues around legal compliance or soundness, except for some of those raised in respect to the proposed changes to Green Belt boundaries at Morden Park (Policy V2) and the proposed holiday park at Morden Park (Policy I5). These responses argued that Green Belt release for the holiday park, which would act as enabling development for a strategic Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG²), had not been evidenced/justified, that these policies were inconsistent with national planning policy relating to the Green Belt and that the HRA of Policy I5 was not compliant with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (Habitats Regulations).
5. The council considered that there was some merit in the issues relating to the supporting justification which it provided for Green Belt release for the Morden Park holiday park. It accepts that the proposed release and allocation were not fully justified and therefore could be considered to be inconsistent with national planning policy (paragraphs 140. and 141. of the National Planning Policy Framework, July 2021). The council does not accept that its consideration of exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries were flawed or the respondents' position that the assessments completed in its HRA were contrary to the Habitats Regulations.

¹ Viewable on the Purbeck Local Plan examination webpages

² One form of heathland infrastructure project.

6. To ensure the local plan was consistent with national planning policy and therefore capable of being found sound, the council invited the Planning Inspector to consider Further Proposed Main Modifications to policies V2 and I5 which would delete reference to release of Green Belt at Morden for a holiday park. Since the delivery of the strategic SANG was linked to the holiday park it was no longer clear that it would be delivered without the enabling development. For this reason, the council also prepared a set of interim mitigation measures for Dorset heaths in the event that the Morden strategic SANG is not delivered. The council also undertook a addendums Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment and updated the proposals map.
7. The consultation on Further Proposed Main Modifications was held between 6 December 2021 and 24 January 2022. The council received a total of 30 responses to the Further Proposed Main Modifications. The representations raised matters/issues relating to:
 - FMM3 – Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, paragraphs 43 and 44;
 - FMM6 – Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, paragraphs 45 to 48;
 - FMM7 – Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, Policy V2;
 - FMM66 – Chapter 5, Economy, Policy EE4;
 - FMM76 – Chapter 6, Infrastructure, paragraphs 256 and 257;
 - FMM77 – Chapter 6, Infrastructure, Policy I5;
 - FMM82 – Chapter 7, Implementation delivery and monitoring, monitoring framework;
 - Interim Mitigation Strategy for Heathland Habitat Sites [FMMCD1];
 - Sustainability Appraisal [FMMCD2];
 - Habitats Regulations Assessment [FMMCD3];
 - Memorandum of Understanding [FMMCD4a to FMMCD4e];
 - Local plan policies maps [FMMCD5a to FMMCD5c].
8. The council has published these representations in full and prepared a consultation response document which summarises the matters/issues that were raised, any steps which the respondent considered were necessary to make the local plan sound/legally compliant and the council's response.
9. One of the representations on Further Proposed Main Modifications was made on behalf of the Charborough Estate. The estate's representation argued that the Further Proposed Main Modifications were not necessary (i.e. that the release of Green Belt to enable delivery of a strategic Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace and holiday park at Morden Park was sound and legally compliant) and that the Further Proposed Main Modifications were unsound and not compliant with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (Habitats Regulations).
10. The estate's representation also argued that the process of compiling Further Proposed Main Modifications and the consultation on these Main Modifications had not been conducted fairly.

11. The Inspectors examining the local plan decided to hold a hearing on 19 July 2022 to allow discussion of the issues raised in representation on Further Proposed Main Modifications. The Inspectors published an agenda for the hearing which covered the following hearing questions:

- ‘Procedural matters’ –
 - Whether it is a reasonable approach for the Council in relation to Morden Park to pursue the proposed further main modifications to Policies I5 and V2 and supporting text (FMM6, FMM7, FMM76, FMM77 and consequential FMM3, FMM66 and FMM82) having taken account of consultation responses received in relation to proposed main modifications (MM6, MM7, MM76 and MM77)?
- ‘Legal compliance’ –
 - ‘Whether the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) insofar as it relates to Policies I5 and V2 (and proposed main modifications and further main modifications as appropriate), together with the associated Interim mitigation strategy for heathland habitats sites (2018/19 to 2022/23), would ensure no significant effects on the integrity of any identified site within the national site network (formerly known as European or Natura 2000 sites)¹, either alone or in combination with other plans and/or projects?’
 - ‘Overall, have the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 now been met by the HRA?’
- ‘Soundness considerations’ –
 - ‘Whether the Plan approach sought by the proposed further modifications to Policies I5 and V2 with respect to proposed Green Belt release and supporting delivery of a SANG at Morden Park, whilst omitting the adjacent holiday park, are justified and consistent with national policy?’
 - ‘Are the proposed further main modifications to Policy I5 otherwise effective in seeking to support delivery of a SANG at Morden Park?’

12. Following the July 2022 hearing, the council corresponded with the Inspectors on a number of issues including:

- nutrient pollution in Poole Harbour (we have needed to review our position on this issue after Natural England provided new guidance on nutrient pollution to councils across the country in March 2022);
- an updated programme for the local plan’s examination (Local Development Scheme);
- the implications of the nutrient pollution guidance and the new Local Development Scheme for housing land supply and the Interim Mitigation Strategy for Heathland Habitat Sites (2018/19 to 2023/24);
- issues and errors with the local plan policies maps; and
- changes to Policy I6: Wareham integrated health and social care.

13. After written exchanges on these issues, the Inspectors issued their interim findings and next steps (24 May 2023) [COR28]. In response to the next steps in the Inspector's interim findings the council prepared a consolidated schedule of Main Modifications (formed from earlier Main Modifications [MM] and Further Proposed Main Modifications [FMM]), that also included novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications [SMM].
14. The consultation on SMM was opened on 10 November 2023 and closed at 11:45pm on 22 December 2023. The council has been clear that the consultation was specifically targeted on the SMM and that it would not be giving consideration to comments that do not relate to the target policies or supporting documents. This document specifically relates to the consultation and responses which the council has received on the SMM.

Consultation on Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications

Schedule of Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications

15. In response to the Inspectors interim findings and next steps letter (24 May 2023) [COR28] the council prepared a consolidated schedule of Main Modifications that includes Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications (SMM) (SMMCD1). The Inspectors also asked the council to prepare:

- an addendum to earlier Habitats Regulation Assessments (HRA). (The HRA addendum considers the implications of SMM) (SMMCD2);
- an addendum to earlier Sustainability Appraisal (SA). (The SA addendum considers the implications of SMM and the findings of the appropriate assessment in the HRA) (SMMCD3);
- an updated 5-year housing land supply report (SMMCD4);
- a paper with an updated assessment of local housing need (SMMCD5);
- a paper summarising issues and errors relating to the local plan policies maps (SMMCD6); and
- updated local plan policies and key (SMMCD7a to SMMCD7k).

Consultation on further proposed Main Modifications

16. The council published its Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications and associated documents (including those requested by the Planning Inspector detailed above), on 10 November 2023. The council arranged for the consultation to take place over 6 weeks (closing on 11:45pm on 22 December 2023).

17. The total duration of the consultation period follows the requirements in Regulations 18 and 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and the guidance provided by the Planning Inspectorate relating to consultation on Main Modifications.

18. The consultation was carried out in accordance with the council's Statement of Community Involvement 2020 (SCI). The council designed its response form to obtain people's views on whether they considered that the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications (where appropriate having regard to supporting documents) were sound and legally compliant. (See Appendix 1 for a copy of the council's response form).

19. The council's preferred method of responding was through its' on-line consultation database but could also be submitted using an electronic form available on the website via email or post. Paper copies were available on request. The form allowed respondents to specify which Supplementary Proposed Main Modification they were commenting on. Responses submitted electronically or in paper copy were accepted provided they were received by the

deadline (11:45pm 22 December 2023) for making representation. The council received one late response after the December deadline, and has confirmed to the respondent that their comments will not be taken into consideration and that their response will not be referred to the Planning Inspectors.

Who was consulted?

20. In accordance with the process relating to consultations undertaken for Regulation 19 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, all specific and general consultees were notified when the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications would be published by either letter or email. A copy of the notification letter is presented in Appendix 2 of this document. The general consultees who were notified include community groups, voluntary groups, landowners and agents who had previously asked to be consulted. (The general and specific consultation bodies are listed in Appendix 8 of the council's Regulation 22 consultation statement [SD07]).

21. As with the earlier Regulation 19 pre-submission publication of the Purbeck Local Plan, the Council also notified those residents and local businesses, who were recorded on its database.

How the publication occurred

22. The following methods were used to give notice that the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications had been published and that documents had been made available for comment:

- all documents were accessible from the council's website (the council's website also included an online response form);
- physical copies of selected key documents and the consultation notice were made available to view at local libraries (including Lytchett Matravers, Wareham, Wool, Swanage, Dorchester and Hamworthy) and council offices;
- the council organised a press release;
- interested parties were given the opportunity to make responses using a paper form that could be posted to the council or by editing an electronic copy of the response which could be attached to an e-mail;
- everyone on the council's local plan database (refreshed post introduction of the General Data Protection Regulations 2018) was notified of the consultation either in writing or by email (see Appendix 6 for a copy of the notification letter and consultation notice); and
- details of the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification were publicised using social media.

23. The methods used to notify consultation bodies / interested parties of publication are consistent with those which the council used as notification that the pre-submission draft Purbeck Local Plan had been published.

24. The council encouraged interested parties to respond digitally using either:
- an online survey form; or
 - an electronic copy of the survey form attached to an e-mail.
25. The council recognises that some people will not have been able to access documents through its website or to make their response digitally (a small proportion of people and organisations on its database had also expressly indicated that they wished to be contacted and updated by post).
26. The council took specific steps to ensure that these people and organisations had the opportunity to engage with the consultation. These included:
- communicating by post with those people, and organisations, who indicated that this was their preferred method of contact;
 - making copies of the consultation documents available to view at local libraries and its offices; and
 - ensuring that officers were available on the telephone to answer questions relating to the consultation documents and the consultation during normal office hours over the consultation period.
27. The council is satisfied that the consultation was carried out fairly and that interested parties have been given the opportunity to make representation on the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications.

Responses on Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications

28. The council received a total of 22 responses on the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications. The number of representations received is lower than at earlier stages during the plan making process. The council considers that the lower level of response reflects the more limited nature and scope of the most recent consultation (which is restricted to a consideration of Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications and attendant documents) and the earlier opportunities to make representation / participate in the examination hearing sessions that were held in summer and autumn of 2019 and 2022.

Consultation	Level of response
Regulation 18 issues and options consultation (2015)	484 representations
Regulation 18 Partial review options consultation (2016)	3,300 representations
Regulation 18 new homes for Purbeck consultation (2018)	6,762 representations
Regulation 19 pre-submission draft Purbeck Local Plan	195 representations
Proposed Main Modifications to the Purbeck Local Plan	40 representations
Further Proposed Main Modification to the Purbeck Local Plan	30 representations
Supplementary Proposed Main Modification to the Purbeck Local Pan	22 representations

Table 1: Representations on local plan consultations

29. The table below lists all respondents who raised comment through the current consultation. Where a respondent has previously made representation, the council has referred to their consultee reference (those respondents who had not already made representation have not been assigned consultee references) and assigned each respondent a consultation reference.

Respondent	Consultee reference	SMM consultation reference
Clare Lees	1189887	SMMR01
Roger Starbuck		SMMR02
Councillor Alex Brenton		SMMR03
Andrew Partick on behalf of Swanage Railway Trust	1190289	SMMR04
Naomi Pickard	1190535	SMMR05
Dr A C Warne	1190865	SMMR06
Mandy Backhouse	1191015	SMMR07
Dr Andrew Langley	1191908	SMMR08
Wendy Riddle	1188362	SMMR09
Philip Saunders on behalf of Wyatt Homes	1190024/1190589	SMMR10

Respondent	Consultee reference	SMM consultation reference
Alf Bush on behalf of Lytchett Matravers Parish Council	1191250	SMMR11
Barry Shephard	1188361	SMMR12
Amanda Marler		SMMR13
Gaynor Gallacher on behalf of Highways England	1191428	SMMR14
Nick Squirrell on behalf of Natural England	1186743	SMMR15
Kim Miller on behalf of Historic England		SMMR16
Rachel Palmer on behalf of Wool Flora & Fauna	1185234/1187112	SMMR17
Deirdre Flegg		SMMR18
Ian Taylor		SMMR19
Gerald Rigler on behalf of CPRE	1191922	SMMR20
Alan Bagley	1191476	SMMR21
Goretti Quinn-Bagley		SMMR22

Table 2: List of respondents to Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications

Council summary of relevant matters of issues raised through consultation relating to Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications

30. This section of the consultation report includes the council's summary of the matters and issues which it considers were raised in responses to the consultation. The council has only sought to summarise those matters and issues raised through responses which it considers could be relevant to whether the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications to the Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034) (taking account of related documents) are legally compliant and sound. Where a response indicates support for a proposed Main Modification, or supporting consultation document, it has not been recorded in this report. Similarly, if a response includes matters or issues which the council felt were outside the scope of the current consultation it has not summarised these issues in this report.
31. For the Inspector's information, the council has compiled an 'overview' list below of those issues which were raised through the consultation which it does not consider relevant to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications. Full copies of all representations to the consultation received during the consultation period will be published on the council's website and passed to the Inspector for consideration.

Relevant issues relating to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications

32. The table below summarises which of the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications and other consultation documents the council has received representations on, the number of respondents who have provided responses on each SMM (the issues raised through responses are summarised in more detail in the following sections for each SMM).

Reference proposed supplementary Main Modification or consultation document	Number of respondents
SMM88	12
SMM1	8
SMM3	10
SMM8	9
SMM14	6
SMM15	9
SMM16	8
SMM86	11
SMM18	8
SMM19	8
SMM20	7
SMM21	7
SMM24	6
SMM25	10
SMM26	8
SMM27	5
SMM28	7
SMM29	6
SMM30	8
SMM31	7
SMM32	7
SMM33	5
SMM35	4
SMM38	8
SMM40	7
SMM41	4
SMM42	8
SMM43	7
SMM45	5
SMM46	7
SMM47	7
SMM48	7
SMM49	7
SMM52	7
SMM53	5
SMM54	6
SMM59	5
SMM60	4
SMM61	4
SMM63	5
SMM64	3
SMM65	4
SMM66	4
SMM68	6
SMM69	4

Reference proposed supplementary Main Modification or consultation document	Number of respondents
SMM71	4
SMM72	4
SMM76	4
SMM77	6
SMM87	5
SMM78	4
SMM81	6
SMM82	5
SMM84	3
SMM85	3
Inset map for Bere Regis	1
Inset map for Wareham	1
Addendum to Habitats Regulation Assessment	1

Table 3: Council summary of respondents to Further Proposed Main Modifications and consultation documents

33. The detailed analysis relating to each SMM summarises the matters and issues raised in responses, and a summary of the changes suggested by the respondent which they consider would make the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. Where the respondent had not suggested a remedy, or not clearly identified a remedy in their response, the council has marked this with N/A.
34. The council has also sought to provide its response to the matters or issues raised by the respondent. It has not presented further evidence through this response, rather it has sought to:
- draw the Inspector's attention to published evidence or policy which it considers addresses the matter or issue; or
 - indicate where revisions to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification should be made in response to the representation; or
 - indicate where it would not object to the Inspector considering an adjustment to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification.

Issues falling outside the scope of the current consultation

35. The council considers that the following issues raised in representation fall outside the scope of this consultation and are not relevant to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications:
36. These issues have not been summarised in detail in this report and the council has not sought to provide detailed responses to each issue. But by way of

general clarification for the respondents who have raised these matters this part of the report includes a brief council response to each issue.

37. Along with responses relating to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications the council also received representation on the scope of the consultation and process of consulting. In summary the issues raised include:

a) **The scope of the consultation** - A respondent (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]) has suggested that the consultation should not be limited to the latest novel Main Modifications presented through the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications and that there should be an opportunity make further response on earlier Main Modifications. Comments from two respondents (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06] and Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]) explicitly relate to earlier Main Modifications, specifically:

- MM9 (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]);
- MM10 (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]);
- MM12 (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]);
- MM13 (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]);
- MM22 (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]);
- MM23 (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]);
- MM36 (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]);
- MM37 (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]); and
- Main modifications tracker presented in Appendix 1 of SMMCD1 (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).

b) **The time of year when the consultation was undertaken** – A respondent (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]) has suggested that the consultation should not have been conducted over the times when people traditionally take their summer holidays or in the period prior to the time when people traditionally take holidays for Christmas. Respondent has suggested that the date of the consultation has deterred people from responding.

38. The council has explained in detail how the consultation was undertaken in this report and the steps which it has taken to ensure that all interested parties have been given opportunity to make comment on the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications. It is satisfied that the consultation process has been conducted fairly and consistently with the earlier consultations.

39. In response to the specific points raised above:

a) **The scope of the consultation** – The council has made it clear through its notifications of the consultation, in the consultation material and on its website that the scope of the consultation was expressly limited to the novel parts of Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications. The council is satisfied that its approach to this issue is both fair, reasonable, and necessary in order to allow the examination of the local plan to progress. All parties to the examination have been the opportunity at earlier stages in the plan making and

examination process to respond on all the policies and strategies presented in the local plan and both Proposed Main Modifications and Further Proposed Main Modifications. The Inspectors responsible for the local plan's examination have also organised a series of local plan hearing sessions in 2019 and 2022 to give interested parties the opportunity to raise issues in person for both the Inspectors and the council's consideration. Reconsidering earlier Main Modifications, or the submission draft version of the local plan, as part of the current consultation is unreasonable because of the earlier opportunities to respond. The Inspectors examining the local plan will also take account of the earlier representation and the issues raised in the hearing sessions when considering whether the local plan is sound and legally compliant. For these reasons the council has not considered the issues raised in the representation of Dr A C Warne and Rachel Palmer which relate to earlier Main Modifications. Many of the other responses also refer to issues that are not connected with Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications or other policies or strategies which fall outside the scope of the current consultation. Where the council considers that this is the case it has stated this as part of its response.

- b) **The time of year when the consultation was undertaken** - The council notes the respondents comments, but is satisfied that the consultation (including the time of year when the consultation was undertaken) has been conducted openly and fairly and is entirely consistent with procedure guidance prepared by the Planning Inspectorate for councils, and other parties, involved in the examination of local plans. The Planning Inspectorate's procedure guidance includes a section relating to Main Modifications to local plans. The fourth bullet point of paragraph 6.9 relates to consultations on Main Modifications and states that: 'the nature and duration of the consultation should reflect that of the consultation held at Regulation 19 stage, where appropriate. This means it should last at least six weeks.' The consultation on Proposed Supplementary Main Modifications opened on 10 November 2023 and closed at 11:45pm on 22 December 2023. The consultation period avoids the traditional holiday periods outlined by the respondent and the council is also satisfied that the duration of the consultation period is entirely compliant with Regulation 19 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Earlier sections of this report clarify that the consultation has been conducted in way which is consistent with the Regulation 19 publication on the local plan and in a manner which does not disadvantage any parties who might wish to make a response.

Changes to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2023)

40. Several respondents³ have suggested that following changes to national planning policy (after publication of the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2023) that local plan policies and the development strategy presented in the local plan are no longer up to date. The respondents' comments are mainly focused on the changes to Green Belt boundaries around Lytchett Matravers and the implications of changes to Paragraph 245 of the NPPF.

41. 'Annex 1: Implementation' of the National Planning Policy Framework sets how the revised policies should be applied to the local plan making process. The Purbeck Local Plan was submitted for examination after 24 January 2019 and therefore paragraph 227. of Annex 1 is not relevant to this local plan. Annex 1 goes onto clarify that:

- a) Paragraph 22 need not be applied to local plans which had not reached Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (pre-submission) stage at the point the previous version of this Framework was published on 20 July 2021. The Purbeck Local Plan was submitted for examination on 28 January 2019 and therefore paragraph 22 need not be applied.
- b) Paragraph 160 need not be applied to local plans that have reached Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (pre-submission) stage. The Purbeck Local Plan was submitted for examination on 28 January 2019 and therefore paragraph 160 need not be applied.
- c) At paragraph 230. that:

'The policies in this Framework (published on 19 December 2023) will apply for the purpose of examining plans, where those plans reach regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (presubmission) stage after 19 March 2024. Plans that reach pre-submission consultation on or before this date will be examined under the relevant previous version of the Framework in accordance with the above arrangements.'

The Purbeck Local Plan was submitted for examination on 28 January 2019 and therefore should be examined against those policies in the National Planning Policy Framework September 2023

42. Appendix 3, 4 and 5 of this consultation response document also include a summary of the revisions to national planning policy which were made in February 2019, July 2021 and September 2023. The council carried out these reviews during the local plan's examination and presents details in this document for information only. The council is satisfied that the emerging Purbeck Local Plan remains consistent with national planning policy.

³ Including but not limited to Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor Alf Bush [SMM11], Deirdre Flegg [SMMR18], Alan Bagley [SMMR21] and Goretti Quinn-Bagley [SMMR22]

Conclusions

43. The council has thoroughly considered and reviewed the issues raised by respondents to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications to the Purbeck Local Plan. Many of the responses have raised issues relating to local plan strategy or policies which are expressly outside the scope of the consultation on Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications. The next section of this report provides summaries of the issues raised through the responses and the councils more detailed response.
44. After considering these issues the council remains satisfied that these Main Modifications and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant. For these reasons the council therefore invites the Inspectors to finalise their report on its examination.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 88: Foreword

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

45. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent suggests that there has been a material change in circumstances following local government re-organisation in Dorset which should prompt the council to review evidence and development strategies in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034) (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06], Wendy Riddle [SMMR09], and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- b) The respondent suggests that Lytchett Matravers is not a sustainable location (lacking infrastructure, in-accessible and defined as Green Belt) for proposed housing allocations and should not therefore be referenced as a key service village (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05], Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07], and Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- c) The respondent suggests that Wool is not a sustainable location (flood risks, biodiversity and organic farmland) for proposed housing allocations (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).
- d) The respondent asserts that the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034) should give greater weight to environmental considerations (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- e) The respondent asserts that the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034) should consider proposals for designation of a National Park in Dorset; (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- f) The respondents state that the approach to nutrient neutrality in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034) is not robust (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- g) The respondent considers that re-assessment of local housing need is likely to reduce biodiversity and would not deliver affordable homes (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

46. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The respondents recommend that the council cease work on the emerging Purbeck Local Plan, and review and update evidence and development strategies as part of the preparation of the Dorset Council Local Plan (2021-2038) (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06], Wendy Riddle [SMMR09], and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- b) The respondents suggest that the council omits the Lytchett Matravers allocation for homes from the emerging Purbeck Local Plan and review & update the settlement hierarchy in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (Naomi

Pickard [SMMR05], Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07], and Lytchett Matravers Parish Council Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).

- c) The respondent suggests that the council omits the Wool allocation for homes from the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).
- d) N/A.
- e) N/A.
- f) N/A.
- g) The respondent suggests that the council should not apply uplifts in the assessment of local housing need which exceed locally derived assessments and the council should not permit development which significantly alters the character and biodiversity of their areas (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Council Response

47. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, the Purbeck Local Plan is at an advanced stage through the examination process. It includes strategies for meeting the areas development needs and updates to policies in the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 (2012) which reflect changes in national policy and an updated evidence base. When adopted the policy allocations in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan Local Plan will make an important contribution to housing land supply and delivery in the Purbeck area and its updated policies will ensure that decisions on planning applications are made taking account of the latest evidence. Paragraph 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) states that:
'It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans can provide for sufficient housing and other development in a sustainable manner. Preparing and maintaining up-to-date plans should be seen as a priority in meeting this objective.'

The spatial scope of the development strategies and planning policies in the emerging local plan are expressly limited to the administrative boundaries of former Purbeck District Council. For this reason, there is not an opportunity to review strategies or policies of the emerging local plan in the context of the larger area that is now defined as Dorset Council. The emerging Dorset Council Local Plan (2021-2038) will allow these assessments, taking account of the Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034). The initial Regulation 18 draft of the Dorset Council Local Plan sought to carry forward all the proposed housing allocations in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (i.e. Lytchett Matravers, Moreton Station / Redbridge Pit, Upton and Wool), including those involving changes to Green Belt boundaries. This draft version of the Dorset Council

Local Plan was prepared in the context of ongoing discussions with neighbouring councils on strategic matters which cross administrative boundaries. Abandoning the emerging Purbeck Local Plan would undermine the supply and delivery of new homes in this area and delay updates to local planning policies. The council remains satisfied that both the additional Main Modifications presented as SMM, and the local plan as whole, is sound and legally compliant.

- b) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position, it has not sought to revise the development strategy for new homes in Purbeck as part of Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications or the settlement hierarchy which was introduced as a Main Modification (MM4) through an earlier consultation. The strategy and settlement hierarchy have been thoroughly examined through earlier stages of the local plan making process. As part of this all parties to the examination have been given the opportunity to present evidence on the sustainability of the proposed allocations and their suitability for development with homes. At earlier stages in the local plan's examination the council has received responses on the development strategy, settlement hierarchy and the suitability of the sites identified around Lytchett Matravers for new homes. Inspector Doward's Matters, Issues and Questions [COR10] expressly reference: spatial strategy (Matter D, The strategy for development , Issue 1: Spatial strategy) and housing allocations (including Policy H6) (Matter E, Housing, Issue 1: housing allocations). Both the council and other third parties presented responses to the Inspector's questions and the issues connected with these questions were also discussed at local plan hearings. The council has also presented evidence on these issues including a 'Settlement Strategy Update, June 2017' [SD65] (initially presented as part of the New Homes for Purbeck Consultation (January 2018), this evidence was re-presented during the local plan's examination). The council remains satisfied that Lytchett Matravers is a sustainable location for new homes, and that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position, it has not sought to revise the development strategy for new homes in Purbeck as part of the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications or the settlement hierarchy which was introduced as a Main Modification (MM4) through an earlier consultation. The strategy and settlement hierarchy have been thoroughly examined through earlier stages of the local plan making process. At earlier stages in the local plan's examination the council has received responses on the development strategy, settlement hierarchy and the suitability of Wool housing allocations. The Inspectors Matters, Issues and

Questions [COR10] expressly reference: spatial strategy (Matter D, The strategy for development , Issue 1: Spatial strategy) and housing allocations (including Policy H5) (Matter E, Housing, Issue 1: Housing allocations). The council has also presented evidence on a 'Settlement Strategy Update, June 2017' [SD65] (published on the council's website as part of the New Homes for Purbeck Consultation (January 2018), this evidence was re-presented during the local plan's examination). The council remains satisfied that Wool is a sustainable location for new homes, and that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- d) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, it does not agree with the respondent's conclusion and is satisfied that the emerging local plan gives appropriate weight to environmental considerations. The emerging local plan includes several policies (including Policy E7, Policy E8, Policy E9 and Policy E10) directly relating to protected habitats, species and biodiversity. Environmental considerations are also cross referenced in other relevant planning policies. The council considers that the emerging local plan reflects the mitigation hierarchy relating to biodiversity presented in the National Planning Policy Framework. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both consistent with national planning policy and legally compliant.
- e) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, there are currently no national parks in the Purbeck area. The council awaits the government's full response to the recommendations in the Landscapes Review Final Report (informally known as the Glover Review, which was published 21 September 2019) in respect to the potential locations for new national parks referenced in the report. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- f) The council disagrees with the respondent's assessment of its approach to nutrient pollution in Poole harbour and nutrient neutrality. The council is satisfied that the approach outlined in SMM86 and SMM21 provides a robust and flexible framework for assessing this issue in accordance with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. The addendum to the Habitats Regulation Assessment (SMMCD2) supports the council's position on this issue. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan is legally compliant.
- g) The council disagrees with the respondent's position on this issue. The SMM do not include revisions to the development strategies presented in the submission draft version of the emerging Purbeck Local Plan. Taking account of relevant evidence (including that provided by landowners and developers,

and site-specific considerations), the council forecasts that the yields of homes from the sites identified in its latest housing land supply will satisfy the updated assessment of local housing need over the local plan period (i.e. 2,976 new homes). Biodiversity has been taken into consideration as part of the plan making process for those sites where policy allocations are included for new homes. Planning applications for new homes will also be assessed against relevant local and national planning policies including the mitigation hierarchy relating to biodiversity in national policy and the requirement for net-gains in biodiversity when the requirements in the Environment Act 2021 take effect (12 February 2024⁴ for larger scale development and April 2024 for smaller scale development). The council also anticipates that affordable homes will be delivered alongside market homes in accordance with Policy H11 of the emerging Purbeck Local Plan. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

⁴ The Environment Act 2021 (Commencement No. 8 and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2024

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 1: Chapter 1, Introduction, Paragraph 3

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

48. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondents consider that there has been a material change in circumstances following local government re-organisation in Dorset which should prompt the council to review evidence and development strategies in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06], Wendy Riddle [SMMR09, Barry Shephard [SMMR12]]).
- b) The respondent considers that changes to Green Belt boundaries have not been fully evidenced or justified (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- c) The respondent considers that Policy E2 should be defined as a strategic policy in accordance with national planning policy and guidance (Kim Miller, Historic England [SMMR16]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

49. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) Cease work on the emerging Purbeck Local Plan, and review and update evidence and development strategies as part of the preparation of the Dorset Council Local Plan (2021-2038) (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06], Wendy Riddle [SMMR09, Barry Shephard [SMMR12]]).
- b) Retain existing Green Belt boundaries (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- c) Redefine Policy E2 as a strategic policy (Kim Miller, Historic England [SMMR16]).

Council Response

50. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, also see its response at paragraph 43 a) of this consultation response document which outline the reasons for continuing with work on the local plan. During the local plan's examination, the council has reviewed the relevance of evidence underpinning local plan policy and strategies and policies. The council has also considered the impacts of changes to national planning policy (see Appendices 3 and 4 for a summary). The council remains satisfied

that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- b) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, it has previously presented evidence around the justification for Green Belt release as part of the local plan's examination including:

- Green Belt Study [SD24];
- Green Belt Study – Pre-submission [SD56];
- Housing background paper [SD19].

Matter C Green Belt, Issue 1: Green Belt of the Inspector Doward's Matters, Issues and Questions (COR10) also expressly relates to the proposed changes to Green Belt boundaries that are defined in the local plan. The council and other parties have been given the opportunity to respond to these questions both in writing and during the local plan hearings. The council is satisfied that exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries have been fully evidenced and justified in accordance with national planning policy and that there were opportunities for other parties to raise issues on this matter as part of the examination process. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- c) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, during the examination hearings (held between July and October 2019) Inspector Doward directed (see the Inspector's Post Hearing Note March 2020) the council to define strategic and non-strategic policies through a Main Modification to the local plan. The justification and reasoning around the council's position on the status of each policy is outlined in paper SD91. Through engagement with local communities during the examination hearings the council took a decision to define Policy E2 as a non-strategic policy to give discretion to local communities to develop their own local policies as part of the neighbourhood plan making process. The local plan designation does not affect the statutory framework for decision taking on designated heritage assets or national policy/guidance. The council first presented the table which details which policies are strategic and which are non-strategic as part of MM1 during the consultation held between November 2020 to January 21. Historic England have previously raised similar issues around SMM1 and the references to Policy E2 as a non-strategic policy in an earlier response (Response Number 31). The council remains satisfied that it is appropriate to define Policy E2 as a non-strategic policy in accordance with paper SD91, and therefore that the proposed Main Modification remains consistent with national planning policy.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 3: Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, paragraphs 43 and 44

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

51. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent notes that the SMM does not reference changes to Green Belt boundaries at Morden and should clarify that changes to boundaries should only be considered for 'non-residential' development (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]);
- b) The respondents consider that Lytchett Matravers is not a sustainable location for growth in the numbers of new homes (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05] and Ian Taylor [SMMR19]) and that the council has not demonstrated that exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries have been fully evidenced and justified. Piecemeal changes to Green Belt boundaries are undermining its function and are not consistent with national planning policy (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07] and Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- c) Respondents consider that Wool is not a sustainable location for growth in the numbers of new homes having regard to employment opportunities, unsustainable patterns of travel arising from the proposed allocation and biodiversity (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09] and Gerald Rigler CPRE [SMMR20]).
- d) Respondents suggest that the development strategy and approach to planning in Purbeck should be re-evaluated in the context of Dorset Council area (Barry Shephard [SMMR12] and Ian Taylor [SMMR19]).
- e) The respondent considers that land should not be released for development to meet unsound housing targets (Gerald Rigler CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

52. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) Consider alternative locations for housing allocations (including those closer to the conurbation, brownfield land and those in more accessible locations) (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]) and omit changes to Green Belt boundaries at Lytchett Matravers (Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- c) N/A
- d) Taking account of the opportunities to deliver homes elsewhere in Dorset Council area, abandon the Purbeck Local Plan as there are no sustainable locations for new homes in this part of Dorset Council (Ian Taylor [SMMR19]).
- e) N/A

Council Response

53. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, following Further Proposed Main Modifications the emerging local plan no longer includes changes to Green Belt boundaries at Morden Park for a holiday park (see SMM76 and SMM77). These changes were first presented as FMM (the consultation on FMM was held between 2021 and 2022). The council has taken account of national planning policy in respect to changes to Green Belt boundaries, gathered evidence to justify changes to boundaries and identified exceptional circumstances as part of preparing the emerging local plan. National planning policy sets out a framework for decision taking on planning applications in the Green Belt and the council does not consider that there is a need for further clarification in respect to proposals for 'non-residential' development. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also its response at paragraph 43. b) and 46. b) of this document. The council has assessed the effects of Green Belt release on the strategic purpose and functioning of the Green Belt through Appendix 2 of its Green Belt Study [SD24]. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also its response at paragraph 43. c) of this document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- d) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also its response at paragraph 43. a) of this document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- e) The council is satisfied that its assessment of local housing need (SMMCD5) has been carried out in accordance with the direction provided by government in national planning policy and guidance. The council has not presented exceptional circumstances through the examination to justify using an alternative approach to assessing housing need. The council remains

satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 4: Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, insert text after paragraph 44

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

54. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that there is insufficient infrastructure at Lytchett Matravers to support planned growth in the numbers of new homes (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- b) The respondent considers that the local plan housing policies should set precise limits on the numbers of new homes permitted on the development sites (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- c) The respondents suggest that the evidence underpinning the settlement hierarchy is out of date (based on that prepared for the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1). The hierarchy should take account of the following evidence:
 - employment numbers;
 - community infrastructure;
 - options for sustainable travel (Ian Taylor [SMMR19]).
- d) The respondent considers that it would be unsound to continue with the Purbeck Local Plan based on an out-of-date consultation and evidence (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

55. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A
- c) Settlement hierarchy should be reviewed in the context of Dorset Council area (Ian Taylor [SMMR19]).
- d) N/A

Council Response

56. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, please also see its response at paragraph 43. c) of this document and its Settlement Strategy Update (2017) [SD65]. The council remains satisfied

that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- b) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, paragraph 37 of Inspector Doward's Post Hearing Note (18 March 2020 [COR11]) states:

'I appreciate that the housing numbers for each of the housing allocations have been informed by an assessment of site constraints and master planning work undertaken by site promoters. However, I am not persuaded from the evidence that as a result of these exercises it is necessary to set definitive or maximum figures for the number of homes on each of the sites. The use of the words 'about', 'around' or 'approximately' when referring to the number of new homes on the sites would ensure consistency with the Framework, avoid ambiguity between the wording of policy H1 and the wording of policies V1, H4, H5, H6 and H7 when referring to the number of homes to be provided on each site and provide a degree of flexibility which does not preclude either more or less homes actually being delivered on each of the sites subject to other policy considerations. Accordingly, I consider this matter should be addressed by Main Modifications to the Plan.'
(Paragraph 37, Inspector Doward's Post Hearing Note [COR11]).

The council is satisfied that the Main Modifications relating to the references of the numbers of homes to be delivered through the proposed housing allocations are necessary to ensure that the local plan policies are positively prepared and effective.

- c) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, it has not sought to revise the development strategy for new homes in Purbeck as part of the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications or the settlement hierarchy which was introduced as a Main Modification (MM4) through an earlier consultation. The council reviewed the settlement hierarchy presented in the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 (2012) as part of the process of preparing the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034). The 'Settlement Strategy Update, June 2017' [SD65] (Presented through the 'New Homes for Purbeck Consultation' 2018 and on the examination webpages) takes account of the following services and facilities when ranking settlements in the hierarchy:
- Retail (including: convenience store, supermarkets [floor area greater than 100 square metres], specialist shops and petrol stations);
 - Facilities for eating and drinking (including: public houses, restaurants and cafes);
 - Financial services (including: Post Offices and banks);

- Public transport (including: bus services and railway stations);
- Health and care (including: hospitals, doctor's surgery, dentist, care and nursing homes and social services facilities);
- Emergency services;
- Meeting places (including: halls, churches and other faith facilities);
- Education (including: nursery/pre-school, first school/primary school/middle school, secondary school, and other education facilities);
- Arts, library and other cultural facilities (including: library/mobile library, and theatre/cinema/art gallery/museum);
- Formal open space/sports facilities (including: playing pitch, children's play area and allotments). (See Table 3 of 'Settlement Strategy Update, June 2017').

The settlement strategy update 2017 also considered population size and compared numbers of services and facilities relative to population size. The settlement strategy update 2017 concludes that Lytchett Matravers should continue to be defined as a key service village. The table presented in SMM4 (initially presented as a proposed Main Modification – MM4) reflects this evidence. The spatial scope of the development strategies and planning policies in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034) are expressly limited to those administrative boundaries of former Purbeck District Council. For this reason, there is not an opportunity to review strategies or policies of the emerging Purbeck Local Plan in the context of the larger area that is now defined as Dorset Council. The emerging Dorset Council Local Plan (2021-2038) will allow these assessments, taking account of the Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034). The Purbeck Local Plan is at an advanced stage through the examination process. It includes strategies for meeting the areas development needs and updates to policies in the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 (2012) which reflect an updated evidence base. When adopted the policy allocations in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan Local Plan will make an important contribution to housing land supply in the Purbeck area in advance of the Dorset Council Local Plan and its updated policies will ensure that decisions on planning applications are made taking account of the latest evidence. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- d) The council has reviewed and updated key evidence (including re-assessing local housing need, reviewing housing land supply and delivery of homes) and responded to changes in circumstances (including updated directions from Natural England in respect to nutrient pollution in Poole Harbour and revisions to national planning policy and guidance) over the course of the local plan's examination. It is satisfied that the evidence, and its responses to changes in circumstance, provide justification for policies and strategies in the emerging local plan which remain consistent with national policy.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 5: Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, Policy V1: Spatial strategy for sustainable communities and key diagram

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

57. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent notes that holiday homes are not clearly defined in the local plan and that there is no further planning policy explanation around the suitability of holiday homes in the Green Belt (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).
- b) The respondents consider that Lytchett Matravers is not a sustainable location for growth in the numbers of new homes (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05] and Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]) and exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release around Lytchett Matravers have not been fully evidenced and justified (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07] and Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- c) The respondent considers that local plan housing policies should set precise limits on the numbers of new homes permitted on the development sites (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09] and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- d) The respondent raises the following concerns:
 - The local plan does not adequately protect biodiversity or protected species;
 - SANGs are flawed as they promote extinction of valued species and introduce vermin;
 - The siting of care homes and sustainable patterns of travel (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).
- e) The respondent considers that the council should review the development strategy in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan, including those changes to Green Belt boundaries around Lytchett Matravers, to reflect a lowering in the assessment of local housing need (Alan Bagley [SMMR21]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

58. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A
- c) Numbers of homes should be precisely defined (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).
- d) Reduce housing target so that it is consistent with real need for local people (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).
- e) N/A

Council Response

59. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Following Further Proposed Main Modifications, the emerging local plan no longer includes changes to Green Belt boundaries at Morden Park for a holiday park (see SMM76 and SMM77). The council has taken account of national planning policy in respect to changes to Green Belt boundaries when preparing the Purbeck Local Plan and does not consider that there needs to be further clarification in respect to 'holiday homes' in the Green Belt in order to allow subsequent assessment of planning applications involving this type of development. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondents' comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. See council response at paragraph 43. b) and 46. b) of this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) The council notes the respondents' comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. See council response at paragraph 52. b) of this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- d) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding this:
 - The council is satisfied that in conjunction with relevant legislation, national planning policy and guidance that the local plan policies provide an effective framework for protecting biodiversity and protected species as part of the planning process. See council response at paragraph 43. d) of this consultation response document.
 - That SANGs provide effective mitigation for the recreational impacts of new residential development on heathland habitat sites (see 'Exploring Heathland Mitigation in Purbeck' Final Report 2016, presented in as part of the 'Options Consultation 2016'). The respondent has not presented any evidence around the claim that SANGs introduce vermin.

- The emerging Purbeck Local Plan does not include policy allocations for care homes. Policies H4 and H5 relating to Moreton Station/Redbridge Pit and Wool were amended through earlier Main Modifications (MM35 and MM38) to deliver 65 extra units at each site. Both sites are well related to railway stations.

Taking account of the respondents comments the council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- e) The council notes the respondent's comments. In response it also notes that SMM27 clarifies that the assessment of local housing need over the plan period has risen from 2,688 new homes to 2,976 new homes. The council is satisfied that the change in local housing need does not affect its earlier conclusion (as justified with the relevant evidence) that there are exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries at Lytchett Matravers. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 6: Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives, paragraphs 45 to 48

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

60. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) Respondents consider that Green Belt release at Lytchett Matravers has not been fully evidenced or justified because:
 - The council has not considered the alternatives to Green Belt release in the context of Dorset Council area;
 - The council has not provided exceptional circumstances;
 - Housing allocations are in unsustainable locations;
 - Release would undermine Green Belt function;
 - Release is not supported by a valid development strategy (spreading development across the Purbeck area does not amount to an exceptional circumstance);
 - Release is not justified because there are suitable brownfield sites in Poole;
 - The policy should clearly state that Green Belt boundaries should endure until the end of the plan period (in accordance with paragraph 145. of the National Planning Policy Framework); and
 - A clarified government position around this issue, including speeches made by Secretary of State Michael Gove and updated National Planning Policy Framework indicate that Green Belt need not be released to meet housing needs (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07], Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11], Ian Taylor [SMM19], Alan Bagley [SMMR21] and Goretti Quinn-Baley [SMMR22]).
- b) The respondent considers that effective use of land and optimum density are not relevant considerations (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07]) when assessing whether to change Green Belt boundaries.
- c) The respondent considers that duty to co-operate discussions around meeting housing needs and Green Belt release in Purbeck should be re-opened with Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07], Ian Taylor [SMM19] and Goretti Quinn-Baley [SMMR22]).
- d) The respondent considers that any changes to Green Belt boundaries (referencing paragraph 145 of national planning policy) made through the local plan should endure to the end of the plan period (2034) (Ian Taylor [SMMR19]).
- e) In respect to the proposed Flowers Drove SANG Lytchett Matravers the respondents note that:
 - Removing land from the Green Belt at Lytchett Matravers will not improve accessibility (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]);

- Proposed SANG will not compensate for changes to Green Belt boundaries (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05], Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07], Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11] and Ian Taylor [SMMR19]);
 - Proposed Flowers Drove SANG at Lytchett Matravers will not be effective because it is too small, already publicly accessible and poorly related to proposed housing allocations around Lytchett Matravers (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07]); and
 - The local community should define compensatory measures for Green Belt release through the neighbourhood plan making process (Ian Taylor [SMMR19]).
- f) The respondent considers that Green Belt release leads to a loss of biodiversity (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- g) Respondents consider that Lytchett Matravers is not a sustainable location for growth in the numbers of new homes (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07], Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11] and Gorette Quinn-Bagley [SMMR22]) and is likely to lead to vehicular congestion on local roads (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07] and Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- h) Respondent raises the following concerns:
- The local plan does not adequately protect biodiversity or protected species;
 - SANGs are flawed as they promote extinction of valued species and introduce vermin;
 - The siting of care homes and sustainable patterns of travel;
 - Housing allocations around Lytchett Matravers are likely to make it a commuter village for the conurbation (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).
- i) Wyatt Homes committed to the delivery of homes on Green Belt sites at Upton and Lytchett Matravers, and delivery of an extension to the French's Farm SANG and the Flowers Drove SANG to act as compensation for Green Belt release. Wyatt Homes plans to work on delivering the Flowers Drove SANG in 2024 (the SANG has planning permission) and has submitted a planning application for the extension to the French's Farm SANG (Philip Saunders, Wyatt Homes [SMMR10]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

61. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) Abandon changes to Green Belt boundaries and review development strategy for new homes (Gorette Quinn-Bagley [SMMR22]).
- b) N/A
- c) N/A
- d) N/A

- e) N/A
- f) N/A
- g) N/A
- h) N/A

Council Response

62. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position, as part of the Purbeck Local Plan's examination evidence has been presented to justify exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries around Lytchett Matravers and Upton. Most of the issues raised through the current consultation have already been considered by Inspector Doward in her Matters, Issues and Questions (Matter C: Green Belt) and subsequently discussed during hearing sessions. The issue relating to Green Belt release in the context of Dorset Council area was not raised in Inspector Doward's questions or discussed at hearings. The spatial scope of the development strategies and planning policies in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034) are expressly limited to the administrative boundaries of former Purbeck District Council. For this reason, there is not an opportunity to review strategies or policies of the emerging Purbeck Local Plan in the context of the larger area that is now defined as Dorset Council. The emerging Dorset Council Local Plan (2021-2038) will allow these assessments, taking account of the Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034). The Regulation 18 draft of the Dorset Council Local Plan sought to "carry forward"⁵ all of the proposed housing allocations in the emerging Purbeck Local Plan (i.e. Lytchett Matravers, Moreton Station / Redbridge Pit, Upton and Wool), including those involving changes to Green Belt boundaries. Respondents to the emerging Purbeck Local Plan will have the opportunity to make further responses and engage in the plan making process for the Dorset Council Local Plan. The council is satisfied that exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries

⁵ With shadow policies reflecting the content of policies in the Purbeck Local Plan:

- Policy H4: Moreton Station / Redbridge Pit, Purbeck Local Plan. Corresponding policy in the emerging Regulation 18 draft Dorset Council Local Plan is Policy CRS2: Moreton Station / Redbridge Pit;
- Policy H5: Wool, Purbeck Local Plan. Corresponding policy in the emerging Regulation 18 draft Dorset Council Local Plan is WOOL1: New housing at Wool;
- Policy H6: Lytchett Matravers, Purbeck Local Plan. Corresponding policy in the emerging Regulation 18 draft Dorset Council Local Plan are LYMT2: Land to the east of Wareham Road, LYMT3: Land at Blaney's Corner and LYMT4: Land to the east of Flowers Drive;
- Policy H7: Upton, Purbeck Local Plan. Corresponding policy in the emerging Regulation 18 draft Dorset Council Local Plan is UPTN1: Land at French's Farm, Policeman's Lane.

around Lytchett Matravers and Upton have been fully evidenced and justified in accordance with national planning policy. The council does not consider that the changes to Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) have substantively changed national policy on this issue. The government's response to consultation on the changes to national planning policy clarifies that: 'National policy continues to expect that Green Belt boundaries can only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, and that this should only be through the plan-making process.' (Underlining is the council's emphasis). (Government response to the Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill: reforms to national planning policy consultation, Updated 19 December 2023). Paragraph 230. of Annex 1 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework also clarifies that:

'The policies in this Framework (published on 19 December 2023) will apply for the purpose of examining plans, where those plans reach regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (pre-submission) stage after 19 March 2024.'

The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- b) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position, it disagrees with the respondent's assertion, and considers that it is relevant to consider optimum densities, and uplifts to these densities, when reviewing development strategies presented in the local plan in accordance with paragraph 146.b) of the National Planning Policy Framework. For the reasons outlined elsewhere in this response document the council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position, duty to cooperate discussions have continued between Dorset Council and Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council as part of the process for preparing their new local plans. The emerging Regulation 18 draft Dorset Council Local Plan includes proposals for changes to Green Belt boundaries around Lytchett Matravers and Upton and provides evidence to justify these changes. Paragraph 4.6.2 of Dorset Council's 'Green Belt Background Paper' (2021) that was prepared for the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan states: 'The council will continue to engage with neighbouring councils to ascertain whether they are able to accommodate any of the council's housing / employment land needs and similarly whether there is a need for Dorset Council to accommodate any of their need. The council will seek to summarise this engagement through a jointly prepared duty to cooperate

statement. The council will publish detail of these strategic duty to cooperate discussions alongside the pre-submission draft of the local plan with conclusions reflected within the draft plan.’ The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- d) The council notes the respondents’ comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council’s position, paragraph 145. of the National Planning Policy Framework states: ‘Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period.’ (Underlining is the council’s emphasis). The drafting of paragraph 145. of national policy does not require Green Belt boundaries to endure beyond the plan period. Paragraph 148.e) of national policy states that when defining Green Belt boundaries, plans should: ‘be able to demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period’. The need for any further changes to Green Belt boundaries following adoption of the Purbeck Local Plan will be reviewed through the work on the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- e) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council’s position, it:
- Notes the respondent’s comments and considers that whilst changes to Green Belt boundaries will not directly compensate for Green Belt loss the provision of SANG (Flowers Drove SANG) will enhance accessibility to this part of the Green Belt, in turn providing compensation for Green Belt release elsewhere.
 - Disagrees with the respondent’s assertion and considers that the proposed Flowers Drove SANG may offset some of the impact of removing land from the Green Belt around Lytchett Matravers by increasing accessibility of the remaining Green Belt (in accordance with paragraph 147. of the National Planning Policy Framework).
 - Disagrees with the assertion that the proposed Flowers Drove SANG is unsuitable. Natural England have advised the council that the SANG will offer effective mitigation and notes that the SANG has now received planning permission (application reference 6/2019/0530 for ‘Change of use of land to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) & associated car park’ 19 May 2021). Wyatt Homes have also confirmed in their response to the consultation that they plan to deliver the SANG in 2024.
 - The council’s approach to defining compensatory measures for Green Belt release around Lytchett Matravers are consistent with paragraph 147. of the National Planning Policy Framework which does not stipulate that

these measures should be determined by local communities as part of Neighbourhood Plan Making.

The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- f) The council notes the respondents' comments, but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position, Wyatt Homes have conducted an ecological survey (see ecological appraisals on examination web pages: 'Section 4: Background documents referred to at July, August and October 2019 hearing sessions') and Policy E10 requires applicants to 'seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity and geodiversity through the restoration, improvement or creation of habitats and/or ecological networks'. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- g) The council notes the respondents' comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also its response at paragraph 43.b) of this consultation document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- h) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also its response at paragraph 55. d) of this consultation document, and for the reasons outlined in its response at paragraph 43. b) the council is satisfied that Lytchett Matravers is a sustainable location for new homes. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- i) The council notes the response from Wyatt Homes.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 8: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraphs 52, 53 and 54

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

63. The council received responses relating to this Further Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that Green Belt release at Lytchett Matravers is not fully evidenced and justified (Naomi Pickard SMMR05).
- b) The respondent criticises the use of the term 'obliged' in respect to responsibilities around AONB and the use of the term 'around' in reference to housing numbers presented for development strategy in Policy V1 (SMM5). (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- c) The respondents suggests that these paragraphs should also reference mitigation of climate change in addition to statutory requirements relating to designated landscapes (AONB) (Wendy Riddle, [SMMR069] and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- d) The respondent does not consider that there are any grounds for continuing with the examination of the Purbeck Local Plan for the following reasons:
 - Evidence base is no longer up-to-date;
 - The local plan does not reference the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 or local Planning for Climate Change Policies;
 - The plan period for the emerging local plan overlaps with both the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 (to 2027) and the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan (to 2038);
 - The council cannot review Green Belt boundaries at Lytchett Matravers before the end of the local plan period for PLP1 especially in those circumstances where housing allocations have been delivered; and
 - The length of the examination and numbers of changes to policies through Main Modifications has created confusion (Ian Taylor [SMMR19]).
- e) The respondent considers that:
 - Not enough weight attached to generating respect for the protection of biodiversity and valued species;
 - Adopting a housing target which is too high compounds this issue. (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

64. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) Increase numbers of homes at Wool and Moreton Station / Redbridge Pitt to avoid Green Belt release (Naomi Pickard SMMR05).
- b) Council should abandon Purbeck Local Plan (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).

- c) Paragraphs should reference climate change and the desirability of conserving landscape which serves to mitigate the effects of climate change (Wendy Riddle, [SMMR069] and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- d) N/A
- e) N/A

Council Response

65. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, also see council response at paragraph 46. b) of this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondents comments but considers that these issues falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, it considers that the use of the term 'obliged' is appropriate in reference to its statutory responsibilities in respect to 'areas of outstanding natural beauty' under section 85 (1) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. In respect to the use of the term 'around' when referencing the numbers of homes that the council anticipates will be delivered through the policy allocation please also see council response at paragraph 52. b) of this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) The council notes the respondents' comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, it considers that it is appropriate for paragraphs 52, 53 and 54 to focus on landscape considerations as they relate to Policy E1: Landscape. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- d) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification of the supporting text for Policy E1: Landscape. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, it:
 - Does not agree with the respondent that the evidence base relating to the Purbeck Local Plan is no longer up to date. The council has reviewed the evidence submitted with the local plan over the course of the examination and remains satisfied that it justifies the policies and development

strategies. Where necessary assessments (including local housing need) and policies have been reviewed and updated to reflect changes in circumstance. Main Modifications have been suggested through the course of the plans examination where necessary.

- The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 revises the planning process in a number of ways, including:
 - Abolishing the ‘duty to cooperate’ and introducing a ‘flexible alignment policy’;
 - Replacing ‘supplementary planning documents’ with ‘supplementary plans’;
 - Introducing a statutory requirement to prepare design codes;
 - Introducing ‘nutrient pollution standards’ for ‘nutrient sensitive catchments’.

Alongside these changes government proposes changes to planning regulations to reform the plan making process (it has indicated that it intends to update regulations by autumn 2024). Whilst the emerging Purbeck Local Plan does not fully reflect the changes in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, the council does not consider it conflicts with the act. Additionally, government has yet to publish the detailed changes to planning regulations. In respect to planning for climate change, the council has recently published 3 documents to guide the consideration of climate change in decisions on planning applications. The documents are to support decision making and do not form part of the development plan but will provide guidance and help applications to maximise opportunities to address climate change. Whilst the emerging Purbeck Local Plan does not expressly reference these 3 documents it does not conflict with them. The emerging Purbeck Local Plan will make a positive contribution to housing land supply and delivery in the Purbeck area, and its policies will update the existing adopted local plan (2012). In these circumstances the council remains satisfied that with relevant Main Modifications the emerging Purbeck Local Plan is both sound and legally compliant.

- The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council’s position, see also its response at paragraph 58. d) of this consultation response document.
 - The council notes the respondents concerns, but has sought to keep all parties updated on progress with the local plan’s examination (copying correspondence with the Planning Inspectors on its website and by ensuring that the examination library of documents is maintained and updated) and present examination materials in accessible formats.
- e) The council notes the respondent’s comments but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the

council's position, the council disagrees with the respondent that the local plan does not give appropriate weight to considerations of biodiversity and protected species (see also its response at paragraph 43. d) of this consultation response document). And the council is satisfied that the emerging Purbeck Local is both positively prepared (outlining a strategy to meet locally assessed housing need over the local plan period), consistent with national policy (including that relating to the mitigation hierarchy for biodiversity) and legally compliant (including The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019). The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 14: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraph 81

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

66. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that a watching brief to protect habitats inadequate (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

67. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A

Council Response

68. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the Main Modifications provide factual clarification on habitat sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest in Purbeck and the legislative and policy framework that should be applied through the planning process. The council does not agree with the respondent that this amounts to a 'watching brief' in respect to habitat site issues. The council is satisfied that its emerging Purbeck Local Plan is both sound and legally compliant with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 15: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraph 83 (insertions and deletions)

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

69. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that changes to Green Belt boundaries are not fully justified and council should consider development on brownfield land within existing settlements (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- b) The respondent considers the council's position is muddled and that it should apply a precautionary approach (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- c) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant as it does not consider in combination effects between planned development in the local plan and other plans / projects in adjacent local planning authorities and increased tourism. The respondent also considers that reference to significant levels of visitor pressures implies that any small increase could lead to significant effects on the habitat site (Dr A Langley [SMMR08]).
- d) The respondent considers that a watching brief to protect habitats is inadequate (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

70. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A
- c) Respondent suggests that impacts need to be thoroughly assessed and mitigation strategy put forward where required (Dr A Langley [SMMR08]).
- d) N/A

Council Response

71. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification or to the SMM (the SMM specifically relates to coastal habitat sites). Notwithstanding the council's position, it has provided responses to the issues raised by the respondent elsewhere in this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- b) The council notes the respondent's comments but does not agree with the that its approach to this issue is muddled. The council's addendum to the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) (SMMCD2) expressly considers the proposed Main Modification and includes a screening assessment for likely significant effects to coastal habitat sites. At paragraph 5.4 the HRA addendum quotes the 2021 HRA as follows:

'Adverse effects on integrity for coastal sites (Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC, St. Albans to Durlston Head SAC) from recreation are ruled out, alone or in-combination given the scale and distribution of growth, the relevant site interest, monitoring results and the existing infrastructure in-place at the coastal sites. In addition, the Dorset Council will keep a 'watching brief', as a back-up to further remove uncertainty. Any small sites that come forward close to the coast will need to address recreation issues as part of the project level HRA, for example through the provision of dog bins, contribution to wardening or path infrastructure. Issues relate to local housing growth (i.e. people walking from their homes and accessing areas away from the tourist 'hotspots') and as such there is no need for in-combination assessment as there is no potential for in-combination effects.' (HRA, 2021).

The HRA addendum goes onto clarify at paragraph 5.5 that:

'As a result of the SMM there are no changes to these conclusions. SMM15 adds reference to the need for a watching brief on coastal SACs (in supplementary text) and therefore strengthens the previous HRA conclusions. Furthermore, new evidence collected by Dorset Council provides further background on the scale of impacts and links to local housing growth (Liley et al., 2022). This work, undertaken with respect to the Dorset Local Plan, includes risk assessment work and visitor surveys. The work flags risks from housing development in the coastal strip where there is easy access onto the SAC (for example direct footpath links or a very short drive to local parking). None of the allocations in the plan fall into this category. Impacts from windfall will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.' (Paragraph 5.5, SMMCD2).

Taking account of the findings from both HRA, the council is satisfied that adverse effects from recreation can be ruled out, alone or in-combination given the scale and distribution of growth, the relevant site interest, monitoring results and the existing infrastructure in-place at the coastal sites habitat sites. The reference to a 'watching brief' in the current Main Modification strengthens the previous HRA (2021) conclusions. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- c) The council notes the respondent's comments but does not agree with his position on this issue. As above (Paragraph 71. b) of this response consultation document) the council is satisfied that adverse effects from

recreation can be ruled out, alone or in-combination given the scale and distribution of growth, the relevant site interest, monitoring results and the existing infrastructure in place at the coastal sites habitat sites. The reference to a 'watching brief' in the current Main Modification strengthens the previous HRA (2021) conclusions. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- d) The council does not agree with respondent's position on this issue, as above the council is satisfied that adverse effects from recreation can be ruled out, alone or in-combination given the scale and distribution of growth, the relevant site interest, monitoring results and the existing infrastructure in place at the coastal sites habitat sites. The reference to a 'watching brief' in the current Main Modification strengthens the previous HRA (2021) conclusions. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 16: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraph 85 (insertions)

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

72. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent suggests that the proposed Morden strategic SANG will not be effective because of its close relationship with heathland habitat site (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).
- b) Respondents suggest that the proposed Flowers Drove SANG at Lytchett Matravers will not be effective, and:
 - Will not provide excess mitigation capacity (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07]).
 - Will not confer environmental improvements (enhancing biodiversity or mitigating climate change) (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
 - The position of the SANG could lead to unsustainable vehicle trips (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07]) and will not be effective for planned homes in the south of the village (Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
 - The SANG is too small to provide effective mitigation (Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- c) The respondent suggests that the Main Modification is unsound because the air quality strategy does not clearly define mitigation measures and it is not clear whether an effective strategy exists (Dr A Langley [SMMR08]).
- d) Respondent suggests that the proposed Coombe Wood SANG at Wool will not be effective because of its location relative to the proposed housing allocation. The respondent goes onto suggest that:
 - The Wool housing developments are not assigned to a specific SANG;
 - Dorset heaths habitat sites should be surrounded by a protective open space; and
 - SANG compensation area and facilities should be greater than what has been lost (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).
- e) No issues (sound and legally compliant). Wyatt Homes endorses the interim mitigation strategy for heathland habitat sites and is able to support the council in the delivery of the extension to the French's Farm SANG, and securing excess mitigation capacity from the Flowers Drove SANG (Philip Saunders, Wyatt Homes [SMMR10]).
- f) A sound policy would avoid the use of discredited mitigation measures such as SANG (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

73. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The respondent suggests that the proposed strategic SANG at Morden should be located at least 100 metres away from heathland habitat site (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).
- b) N/A
- c) N/A
- d) N/A
- e) N/A
- f) N/A

Council Response

74. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's suggestion but taking account of guidance from Natural England and the assessments undertaken through Habitats Regulation Assessments through the local plan's examination, it is satisfied that the proposed strategic SANG at Morden would provide effective mitigation from the recreational connected with new homes.
- b) The council notes the respondent's position on this issue but does not agree with their assertions. Taking account of guidance from Natural England, and the assessments made through the Habitats Regulation Assessment as part of the local plan making process, the council is satisfied that the proposed Flowers Drove SANG will provide effective mitigation for the recreational impacts of new homes on Dorset heaths habitat sites. In specific response to the other issues raised by respondents:
 - The council notes but disagrees with the respondents view on this issue. The council has presented evidence around the calculations of mitigation capacity for SANG in the Interim Mitigation Strategy for Heathland Habitat Sites (FMMCD1) (see paragraphs 185. to 198) (the council has also presented an update on interim mitigation projects, November 2022, SD146). Taking account of guidance from Natural England, the council is satisfied that the assessment of mitigation capacity for the Flowers Drove SANG in Lytchett Matravers is robust.
 - The council notes the respondent's criticism that use of the SANG will not enhance biodiversity or mitigate against climate change but considers that the SANGs primary function is to provide mitigation for Dorset heaths habitat sites. The evidence presented through the local plan's examination confirms that it will be effective in this role.
 - The council notes the respondent's criticism, but notwithstanding this considers that the proposed SANG will provide effective mitigation for Dorset heaths habitat sites (including from the impacts arising from

planned growth around the southern side of the village) and notes that it would be difficult to find a suitable location for a SANG around Lytchett Matravers that was equally accessible for all existing and proposed residents. As part of this the council notes that the proposed SANG is well positioned to encourage sustainable and active travel with proposed (including the proposed housing allocations at Blaney's Corner and Flowers Drove) and existing homes in the northern part of Lytchett Matravers.

- The council notes the respondent's criticism but after conducting Habitats Regulation Assessment and taking guidance from Natural England it is satisfied that the proposed SANG is large enough to provide effective mitigation for the planned homes located around Lytchett Matravers.
- c) The previous Habitat Regulation Assessment (2021) made the following conclusions on air quality issues:

'With annual growth of 180 dwellings and that growth focussed to the west of the Purbeck area, risks to European sites are low. Traffic modelling indicates that, for the quantum of growth in the Purbeck Local Plan at Main Modifications, adverse effects on integrity for the Dorset Heaths SACs/SPA/Ramsar and Poole Harbour SPA/Ramsar in relation to air quality can be ruled out alone.

Given the scale of traffic increases and locations for growth, plus an interim strategy to address air quality impacts to the Dorset Heathlands (now adopted by Dorset Council), in-combination effects can also be eliminated for the short-term.'

Paragraph 7.5 of the addendum to this assessment (SMMCD2) notes that the earlier conclusions rely upon the interim air quality strategy in order to rule out adverse impacts. This strategy:

- Has been adopted by both Dorset Council and Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
- Identifies a series of short term mitigation projects (for the period between 2020 and 2025).
- Provides a framework for funding mitigation.
- Clarifies that the councils will monitor the effectiveness of the strategy. (Paragraph 7.5, addendum to Habitats Regulation Assessment, SMMCD2).

Since the Habitats Regulation Assessment was drafted the councils' have appointed a project officer who has begun to develop and work on the delivery of necessary air quality mitigation projects. Paragraph 7.8 of the addendum to the Habitats Regulation Assessment (SMMCD2) concludes that:

'The strategy allows the Council to be confident that adverse effects on integrity on the Dorset Heaths SACs/Dorset Heathlands SPA/Ramsar can be ruled out alone. The strategy is a joint approach with BCP Council and therefore also ensures in-combination effects can also be ruled out.'

In accordance with this assessment the council is satisfied that it has jointly developed an effective strategy which sets out possible mitigation projects for the interim period. The monitoring requirements will ensure that the councils review their position around this issue. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- d) The council notes the respondent's position on this issue but does not agree with her assertions. Taking account of guidance from Natural England, and the assessments made through the Habitats Regulation Assessment as part of the local plan making process, the council is satisfied that the proposed Coombe Wood SANG will provide effective mitigation for the recreational impacts of new homes around Wool on Dorset Heaths habitat sites. In response to the other issues raised by the respondent the council notes that:
- The proposed Coombe Wood SANG at Wool will provide mitigation for the planned housing allocations identified in the local plan (Policy H5) (the SANGs is expressly identified on the local plan policies map relating to Wool [SMMCD7k]).
 - Policy E8 includes a requirement which states that new residential development will not be permitted within a 400 metre area around the boundaries of Dorset Heath habitat sites. The Purbeck Local Plan is a land use plan which once adopted must be taken into consideration when taking decisions on planning applications. It does not make provision for actively creating undeveloped open spaces around existing heathland.
 - Guidance and direction from Natural England, and the council's habitat regulations assessments, indicate that the proposed Coombe Wood SANG will provide effective mitigation for the recreational impacts connected with the Wool housing allocation (Policy H5) in the emerging local plan.

The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- e) Council notes response from Wyatt Homes.
- f) Council notes response but is satisfied that proposed SANG will provide effective mitigation measures for Dorset Heaths habitat sites for the reasons outlined elsewhere in this consultation response document.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 86: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraphs 86 to 91

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

75. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant as it is based upon inaccurate information provided by Environment Agency, Natural England and Wessex Water (Clare Lees [SMMR01]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modifications is both unsound and not legally compliant as it:
 - Does not present an accurate summary of the condition of Poole Harbour or the contribution that agriculture makes to the harbour's condition;
 - The approach to mitigation involving changes in the way land is managed could lead to lags, or delays, between the date when the new management takes effect and the date when nutrient flows from the land are reduced;
 - Does not recognise that nutrient enrichment of the harbour is also contributing to climate change;
 - The local plan should include consideration of the upgrades to wastewater treatment works (WWTW);
 - Pollution from micro plastics and micro rubber should be screened for likely significant effects on Poole Harbour (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- c) The respondent considers that the Main Modification lacks clarity and that the impacts from the different sources of pollution should be more precisely quantified. The respondent suggests that clarification is needed on:
 - The environmental significance of both phosphorous and nitrogen;
 - The upgrades to WWTW described as nutrient pollution standards in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 (the respondent notes that there is no certainty around the application of these standards);
 - The evidence relating to the claim that the application of the nutrient pollution standards could remove the need for phosphorous mitigation measures (Dr A Langley [SMMR08]).
- d) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant because:
 - The council's handling of this issue has been a farce;
 - The Main Modification takes out references to the nitrogen reduction in Poole Harbour supplementary planning document;
 - The council position on this issue will be unclear for developers;
 - That the Poole Harbour catchment map excludes Wool;

- That the council should refuse planning permission for development until adequate mitigation has been provided; and
 - That the use of Grampian style planning conditions to control development would not be appropriate (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).
- e) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because it does not mention phosphorus pollution. The respondent states that the continuing growth of algal mats in Poole Harbour should not be ignored, and that these mats are key evidence of inappropriate levels of pollution (Gerald Rigler [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

76. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The respondent suggests that:
- The drafting of the plan should retain the word sewage;
 - That the term nutrient should be replaced with the term nitrate and phosphate pollution;
 - Replace the phrase 'MOST OF THE NUTRIENT LOAD IN POOLE HARBOUR ARISES FROM AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY, BUT A PROPORTION (APPROXIMATELY 15%) IS GENERATED BY WASTEWATER ARISING FROM URBAN AREAS' with "the nutrient load in Poole Harbour arises from a variety of sources including, but not exclusively from, agriculture (both historic and current) and sewage and wastewater." (Clare Lees [SMMR01])
- b) N/A
- c) Respondent suggests that N and P should be addressed separately. As part of this levels of pollutant should be quantified and the impacts of nutrient pollution standards assessed (Dr A Langley [SMMR08]).
- d) N/A
- e) N/A

Council Response

77. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's assertion but in the absence of specific evidence to the contrary is satisfied that the evidence underpinning guidance from key consultees is both relevant and accurate. The council does not consider that any of the changes suggested by the respondent are necessary to make the local plan sound and legally compliant and it remains satisfied

that the proposed Main Modification and local are legally compliant and sound.

b) The council notes the issues raised by the respondent and in response:

- The council disagrees with the respondent and is satisfied that the Main Modification provides an accurate summary of the issues related to nutrient pollution in Poole Harbour (there are opportunities for interested parties? to access further, more detailed contextual information relating to the harbours condition, for example including Natural England's guidance issued in March 2022 and the Poole Harbour Consent Order Technical Investigation and Recommendations, February 2021).
- The council notes the response and that this issue has been previously discussed at the local plan hearings held in 2019. The council remains satisfied that changes in land management provide an effective means of mitigating the impacts of new homes, tourist development and attractions in the harbour's catchment. The council also notes that nutrient mitigation is not limited or restricted to changes in land management. The council is actively exploring other mitigation measures including, but not limited to, wetlands and improvements to the performance of existing package treatment plants and septic tanks.
- The council notes the respondents comment but considers that the Main Modifications accurately summarise the key issues relating to the harbour which should inform this part of the local plan (including Policy E9). The council also notes that the approach to nutrient neutrality should assist in limiting the impact of nutrient enrichment's contribution to climate change.
- The council notes the respondent's comments but does not agree that the local plan should include any specific requirements for upgrades to WWTW. These matters are subject to separate legislative control, regulations, monitoring, and enforcement that all fall outside the remit of land use planning. At the time the Main Modifications to the emerging Purbeck Local Plan were being prepared the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, and the requirements relating to the nutrient pollution standards contained in the act, had not received Royal Assent (26 October 2023). There remains uncertainty around how the nutrient pollution standards will be applied in Poole Harbour as the council awaits clarification from government through the Secretary of State on which catchments will be defined as nutrient sensitive and at which WWTW the standards will be applied. Given the uncertainty relating to the standards and the separate legislative regimes relating to these standards the council does not agree that it would be appropriate for the local plan to include specific consideration of upgrades to WWTW.
- The council notes the respondent's comments but it is satisfied that the screening assessments conducted for the purposes of the Habitats Regulation Assessment are both sufficiently detailed and robust.

c) The council notes the issues raised by the respondent and in response:

- The council is satisfied that the Main Modification provides an accurate summary of the key issues (the Main Modification specifically clarifies that both phosphorous and nitrogen contribute towards adverse impacts on the condition of the harbour).
- The council is satisfied that the local plan provides an accurate summary of the relevant information for the purposes of decision taking. Interested parties will have the opportunity to review the detailed terms of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 should they wish. The drafting of the Main Modification recognises and acknowledges the ongoing uncertainty relating to the application of the nutrient pollution standards in Poole Harbour.
- The council has received the following statement from Natural England on this matter as part of its letter of the 26 August 2022:

‘In contrast to nitrogen the Government announced improvements at the WWTWs would deliver the entire phosphorus reductions required to ensure that phosphorus is no longer an impediment to the harbour reaching favourable condition. Therefore, provided the LURB statutory requirement for improvements at the WWTWs is in place, from 2030 onwards phosphorus neutrality will no longer be a requirement for new development within the Poole Harbour catchment. Further, Natural England is also satisfied that the small increases in phosphorus that would result from new development up to 2030 would not cause further harm to the designated sites or have any impact on achieving the necessary reductions in phosphorus loads from the WWTWs. That is, the reduction in phosphorus from WWTW discharges required in the LURB (once enacted) would be enough to secure favourable condition irrespective of any additional phosphorus resulting from development up to 2030 and for the foreseeable future. On this basis new development assessed after the LURB is enacted (anticipated April 2023) would no longer be required to implement phosphorus neutrality measures. However, new permissions given prior to the enactment of the LURB will be required to demonstrate through Appropriate Assessment that appropriate measures or safeguards are in place to ensure phosphorus neutrality. Natural England is currently in discussion with Dorset Council as to how this can be achieved.’

The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- d) The council notes the issues raised by the respondent and in response:
- Does not agree with the respondent’s conclusion around its handling of this issue.
 - Paragraph A6. in the Annex to Inspector Doward’s Post Hearing Note (March 2020, COR) states the following:
‘A number of policies within the submitted Plan require compliance with an SPD or other standalone document thereby purporting to give

development plan status to documents which are not part of the Plan and which have not been subject to the same process of preparation, consultation and examination. This would not be compliant with the Regulations. In preparing the revised composite schedule of suggested Main Modifications a thorough check should be made to ensure that all these references have been removed from the policies of the Plan.'

SMM86 specifically relates to the supporting text for Policy E9, whose drafting has been amended to take out references to the Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour Supplementary Planning Document in accordance with Inspector Doward's direction. SMM86 continues to reference this supplementary planning document, but clarifies that the document is being reviewed and provides direction around how nutrient loads from development should be calculated.

- Notes the respondent's comments, but it is satisfied that the Main Modifications (including those relating to Policy E9) clearly set out its approach to this issue.
- Disagrees with the respondent's observation and confirms through this response that Wool is included within the Poole Harbour catchment area (see SMMCD7b).
- Notes the response and is satisfied that the Main Modifications to supporting text and relevant emerging planning policies provide an appropriate framework for ensuring that decision taking is consistent with the requirements of The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.
- Notes the response. The Main Modification does not reference Grampian style planning conditions. National planning policy (Paragraph 57. of the National Planning Policy Framework) and planning practice guidance set out the tests for the use of planning conditions. The council does not consider that national policy and guidance need be repeated in the emerging local plan.

The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- e) The Main Modifications in SMM86 expressly reference phosphorous pollution in Poole Harbour as part of the nutrient pollution issue. The policies, and Main Modifications to these policies, demonstrate that the council is not ignoring the nutrient pollution issue in Poole Harbour. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 18: Chapter 3 Environment, paragraphs 95

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

78. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is unsound, because of adverse impacts on local area from development (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is unsound and not legally compliant as it does not provide justification for revisions to the area around Corfe Common where evidence indicates likely significant effects (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- c) The respondent considers that it would be unsound to treat avoidance as equivalent to mitigation, and states that there is a need to protect biodiversity and valued species as a constraint on planning for housing (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

79. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) Respondent suggests that development should be focused on brownfield land in towns (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- b) N/A
- c) N/A

Council Response

80. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes that the respondent's comments which do not appear to specifically relate to the Main Modification. Notwithstanding this, the council is satisfied that the proposed housing allocations referenced elsewhere in the emerging local plan are sound and legally compliant. The council is also satisfied that it explored different strategies for meeting the areas housing needs as part of plan making process (evidence of this is presented on the examination web pages), and the opportunities to deliver homes on previously developed or brownfield land. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondent's comments but is satisfied that the addendum to the Habitats Regulation Assessment (SMMCD2) provides the

necessary justification for the Main Modification. Paragraph 4.5 of the addendum states that:

‘Corfe Common SSSI falls within the Dorset Heaths SAC and the Dorset Heathlands Ramsar but is not part of the Dorset Heathlands SPA. The site is different to other components of the Dorset Heaths as it sits on the Purbeck Wealden Beds and is predominantly grassland and wet flushes. It is of considerable botanical importance and supports a suite of rare plants. The Southern Damselfly also occurs on the site.’

And at paragraph 4.7 that:

‘Corfe Common is not part of the Dorset Heathlands SPA and does not hold notable populations of heathland bird species, it is also less vulnerable to fire compared to drier areas of the Dorset Heaths that support more typical heathland vegetation. The different approach is therefore justified. No actual allocations or level of growth within 400m of the site are proposed within the Plan. The SMM serves to clarify the issues and risks. Adverse effects on integrity to the Dorset Heaths SAC and Dorset Heathlands Ramsar from recreation/urban effects can be eliminated due to the need to ensure project level HRA. With adverse effects on integrity alone eliminated, there is no need for in-combination assessment.’

The council is satisfied that the Main Modification is suitably justified and that its approach to this issue is legally compliant with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.

- c) The council notes the respondent’s comments but is satisfied that the Main Modification does not conflate avoidance with mitigation. The addendum to the Habitats Regulation Assessment (SMMCD2) provides more detailed explanation around the nature and context of Corfe Common which justifies the council’s approach to this issue. The council is satisfied that the emerging local plan considers biodiversity, protected species and habitat sites as material planning considerations in the context of established legal and policy frameworks relating to this issue. The council remains satisfied that its approach to the Main Modification is justified and that the changes themselves are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 19: Chapter 3 Environment, Policy E7

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

81. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is unsound, because of adverse impacts on local area from development (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant as it does not reference functionally linked habitats around designated sites (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- c) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant as:
 - The drafting of the policy does not provide adequate protection for habitat sites (Dorset heaths) in the north of Wool;
 - The proposed SANG at Coombe Wood Wool is likely to have an adverse impact on the Plantation on Ancient Woodland Site (PAWS) and should be omitted from the local plan proposals (allocation of the Coombe Wood SANG is inconsistent with national planning policy relating to irreplaceable habitats);
 - Local plan allocations at Wool are inconsistent with habitats regulations, Sites of Special Scientific Interest legislation and national policy relating to biodiversity (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

82. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A
- c) If Coombe Wood SANG at Wool is omitted from the local plan (see respondent's reasons above) the recreational impacts from proposed homes at Wool on Dorset heaths will not be mitigated and therefore the allocation should also be omitted (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).

Council Response

83. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes that the respondent's comments do not appear to specifically relate to the Main Modification. Notwithstanding this, the council is satisfied that the proposed housing allocations referenced elsewhere in the emerging local plan are sound and legally compliant. The council is also

satisfied that it explored different strategies for meeting the areas housing needs as part of plan making process (evidence of this is presented on the examination web pages), and the opportunities to deliver homes on previously developed or brownfield land.

- b) The council notes the respondent's comments but remains satisfied that the Main Modifications and drafting of the policy itself is both sound and legally compliant with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. The policy sets out a framework for decision taking which is consistent with the relevant legislation. The process of decision taking within this framework allows the issue of functionally linked habitats around habitat sites to be considered in both screening for likely significant effect and when undertaking appropriate assessments. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) The council acknowledges the respondents comments', but:
- Does not agree with the assertion that the policy fails to provide adequate protection for a specific heathland habitat site or heathland habitat sites in general. The council's addendum to the Habitats Regulation Assessment (SMMCD2), and earlier assessments, have reviewed the drafting of this policy on several occasions. The council is satisfied that the drafting of this policy is both sound and legally compliant with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.
 - Notes that Policy E7 does not expressly relate to, or refer to, the proposed Coombe Wood SANG at Wool and for this reason does not consider that this particular comment is relevant to this Main Modification. Notwithstanding this the council is satisfied that the proposed Coombe Wood SANG will provide effective mitigation measures for the planned homes in Wool and that the site selected for the SANG is suitable. The council's position on this issue is supported by those assessments in its Habitat Regulations Assessments that have been carried out of the course of the local plan's examination. Natural England also agree with the council that the proposed SANG will provide effective mitigation and appropriately located relative to development (see pages 13 and 14 of the 'Memorandum of Understanding between Dorset Council and Savills (on behalf of the owners of the land encompassed in the Wool H5 draft allocation)' (Natural England are also party to the section of the memorandum relating to Coome Wood SANG)).
 - As above the council notes that the respondent's comment does not directly relate to the proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding this, the council remains satisfied that the proposed Coombe Wood SANG will provide effective mitigation for the planned homes around Wool and that the SANG site is otherwise suitable for this proposed use..

The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 20: Chapter 3 Environment, Policy E8

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

84. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is unsound, because of adverse impacts on local area from development (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- c) The respondents consider that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant because there should be no exceptions for care home developments within the 400metre area around protected heaths boundaries. The 400 metre areas should act as 'green channels' to allow interconnectivity between heathland habitat sites (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09] and Barry Shephard [SMMR012]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

85. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) Respondent suggests that development should be focused on brownfield land in towns (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- b) N/A
- c) N/A

Council Response

86. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes that the respondent's comments do not appear to specifically relate to the Main Modification. Notwithstanding this, the council is satisfied that the proposed housing allocations referenced elsewhere in the emerging local plan are sound and legally compliant. The council is also satisfied that it explored different strategies for meeting the areas housing needs as part of plan making process (evidence of this is presented on the examination web pages), and the opportunities to deliver homes on previously developed or brownfield land. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondent's comments which do not clarify the reasons why he considers the Main Modification is unsound and not legally compliant. The council does not agree with the respondent's assertions and is

satisfied that the changes are necessary and that the resulting policy is both sound and legally compliant (as assessed through its Habitats Regulation Assessments).

- c) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. The references to care homes as an exception to the general position on new residential development within 400metres of Dorset heaths habitat sites was included in the submission draft text of the local plan. The screening assessment in the 'Habitats Regulation Assessment of the Pre-submission Publication of the Purbeck Local Plan Review' (September 2018 [SD03]) for Policy E8 suggests that this is a: 'Restrictive policy implementing the established avoidance and mitigation measures for Poole Harbour'. And that there will be: 'No LSE (Likely Significant Effects) – strong protective policy and comprehensive supporting text'. The exception in Policy E9 is expressly limited to specific types of residential development that because of their nature and characteristics would not lead to recreational pressure on the heathland habitat sites. The council's position on this policy has been assessed and found to be legally compliant with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 through earlier Habitats Regulations Assessments. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 21: Chapter 3 Environment, Policy E9

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

87. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is unsound, because of adverse impacts on local area from development (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant for the following reasons:
 - The Main Modification takes out reference to the Poole Harbour Supplementary Planning Document from Policy E9;
 - The Main Modifications leave the policy unclear for developers
 - The catchment map excludes Wool;
 - Redrafting of the policy text weakens protection against further damage to Poole Harbour;
 - Not clear whether tourism development is likely to contribute toward nutrient loading in the harbour (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

88. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) Respondent suggests that development should be focused on brownfield land in towns (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).
- b) Response suggests that the Main Modification omits change to Policy E9, that the local plan should provide further clarification around mitigation measures and that the council should refuse planning permission for qualifying development until adequate mitigation has been provided (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).

Council Response

89. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes that the respondent's comments do not appear to specifically relate to the Main Modification. Notwithstanding this, the council is satisfied that the proposed housing allocations referenced elsewhere in the emerging local plan are sound and legally compliant. The council is also satisfied that it explored different strategies for meeting the areas housing

needs as part of plan making process (evidence of this is presented on the examination web pages), and the opportunities to deliver homes on previously developed or brownfield land. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

b) The council notes the issues raised by the respondent and in response:

- Paragraph A6. in the Annex to Inspector Doward's Post Hearing Note (March 2020, COR) states the following:

'A number of policies within the submitted Plan require compliance with an SPD or other standalone document thereby purporting to give development plan status to documents which are not part of the Plan and which have not been subject to the same process of preparation, consultation and examination. This would not be compliant with the Regulations. In preparing the revised composite schedule of suggested Main Modifications a thorough check should be made to ensure that all these references have been removed from the policies of the Plan.'

SMM21 relates to Policy E9, whose drafting has been amended to take out references to the Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour Supplementary Planning Document.

- The council is satisfied that the Main Modifications relating to Policy E9 clearly set out its approach to this issue.
- The council disagrees with the respondent's observation and confirms through this response that Wool is included within the Poole Harbour catchment area (SMMCD7b).
- The council disagrees with the respondent's conclusion that the Main Modifications to the policy will weaken the protection conferred to Poole Harbour habitat site. The Main Modifications have been based on the latest advice and guidance from Natural England (which clarifies that both phosphorous and nitrogen contribute to nutrient pollution in the harbour). The references to further sources of pollutant strengthen rather than weaken the policy requirements and therefore the protection conferred through the policy against further damage to the harbour that might be related to development.
- The Main Modification to Policy E9 states that: 'Development proposals that would result in an increase in nutrient loading within the Poole Harbour catchment, will need to demonstrate compliance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 or any equivalent relevant legislation or regulations'. The council is satisfied that the policy clearly defines how and when it should be applied and that it is therefore effective.

The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 25: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 110 and 111

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

90. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondents consider that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant, and that the development strategy should be re-appraised in the context of Dorset Council area and duty to co-operate discussions with neighbouring councils should be reviewed to explore opportunities to deliver homes in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council area (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09], Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11] and Deirdre Flegg [SMMR18]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modifications are both unsound and not legally compliant as:
 - Green Belt release around Lytchett Matravers has not been fully evidenced and justified.
 - National policy relating to Green Belt has been clarified.
 - The council has not properly assessed the types of homes required.
 - Lytchett Matravers is not a sustainable location for new homes (there are limited opportunities for residents to access the village using sustainable or active means of travel) (Deirdre Flegg [SMMR18]).
- c) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is unsound as delivering more homes will not reduce house prices because demand is too high. The respondent suggests that a sound approach involves meeting local needs by applying a suitable locally derived target (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMM20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

91. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A
- c) N/A

Council Response

92. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this

issue, see also its response at Paragraph 43. a) of this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- b) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see its responses to each of the issues raised by the respondent below:
- See council response at Paragraph 58. a) of this consultation response document.
 - See council response at Paragraph 58. a) of this consultation response document.
 - The council presented a 'SHMA Update for Purbeck' (August 2018) [SD20] with the submission draft Purbeck Local Plan. This update outlines the need for different tenures and types of homes. The evidence informed the requirements in Policy H9: Housing mix.
 - See council response at Paragraph 43. b) of this consultation response document.

The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- c) The council is satisfied that the Main Modification is sound as it references and has been justified by a robust assessment of local housing need that has been prepared in accordance with the methodology provided by government. The council has not found exceptional circumstances for applying a different methodology in when assessing housing need in Purbeck. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 26: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H1

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

93. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondents consider that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant and the drafting of the text does not accurately reflect community intentions in Lytchett Matravers to explore allocations for new homes and changes to Green Belt boundaries as part of the neighbourhood plan making process (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07] and Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant as the need for homes is overstated (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).
- c) The respondent raises no issues with the Main Modification and states that Wyatt Homes supports cross reference between the housing land supply in neighbourhood and local plans to avoid confusion when taking decisions on planning applications and in order to support delivery. Wyatt Homes is committed to delivery of c 67 homes on Bere Regis Neighbourhood Plan allocations (Philip Saunders, Wyatt Homes [SMMR10]).
- d) The respondent considers that the assessment of housing needs for the Purbeck Local Plan is not robust and should not take account of unmet need from neighbouring councils (Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- e) The respondent considers that housing needs should be assessed using local information not out of date national information (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

94. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The respondent considers that decisions relating to the growth of Lytchett Matravers should be taken through the neighbourhood plan making process and suggest that the local plan should take out all references to housing allocations and Green Belt release around Lytchett Matravers (Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- b) The respondent considers that the council should reassess housing need (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).
- c) N/A
- d) N/A
- e) N/A

Council Response

95. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (the table in Policy H1 was introduced through MM26). Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue it notes the respondents' comments but is satisfied that the text in the table of Policy H1 accurately summarises the position in the made Lytchett Matravers Neighbourhood Plan in respect to policy allocations for new homes. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondent's position on this issue but is satisfied that the assessment of local housing need has been carried out in accordance with government methodology. The council has not found exceptional circumstances for applying a different approach to assessing local housing need in the Purbeck area. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) Council notes response from Wyatt Homes.
- d) The council notes the respondent's position on this issue but is satisfied that the assessment of local housing need has been carried out in accordance with government methodology. The council has not found exceptional circumstances for applying a different approach to assessing local housing need in the Purbeck area. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- e) The council notes the respondent's position on this issue but is satisfied that the assessment of local housing need has been carried out in accordance with government methodology. The council has not found exceptional circumstances for applying a different approach to assessing local housing need in the Purbeck area. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 27: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 114

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

96. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that:
 - The revised local housing needs assessment shows a reduction in the total numbers of homes required over the local plan period and that this should prompt a review of the development strategy for new homes and Green Belt release;
 - The council should review the development strategy for new homes and Green Belt release following local government reorganisation (Alan Bagley, [SMMR21]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

97. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A

Council Response

98. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments and responds as follows:
 - SMM27 states that the revised local housing needs assessment will lead to an increase in the total numbers of homes required over the local plan period (rising from 2,688 dwellings to 2,976 dwellings, see also SMMCD5). The council remains satisfied that the development strategy and the proposed housing allocations in the emerging local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
 - See council response at Paragraph 58. a) of this consultation response document.

The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 28: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 116 and 117

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

99. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is unsound because it lacks clarity around Green Belt boundaries and how long these boundaries might last (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).
- b) The respondent considers that housing need has not been accurately assessed (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).
- c) The respondent confirms that Wyatt Homes is committed to delivering homes on allocations in the emerging local plan (Lytchett Matravers and Upton) and made neighbourhood plans (Bere Regis). Wyatt Homes support the amendments in SMM as a means of ensuring delivery of an appropriate variety of small, medium and large sites (Philip Saunders, Wyatt Homes [SMMR10]).
- d) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is unsound and that the council should take out references to the word around when seeking to define the numbers of homes permitted on each housing site (Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

100. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) The respondent considers that housing need should be reassessed locally (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).
- c) N/A
- d) The respondent considers that policies should seek to precisely define the numbers of homes permitted on each site (Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).

Council Response

101. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but is satisfied that the emerging local plan clearly defines those locations where changes to Green Belt boundaries are proposed. The council is mindful of the requirements in national planning policy at paragraphs 145. and 148. e) around the permanence of Green Belt boundaries, but this issue may be reconsidered as

part of the work on the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- b) The council notes the respondent's position on this issue but is satisfied that the assessment of local housing need has been carried out in accordance with government methodology. The council has not found exceptional circumstances for applying a different approach to assessing local housing need in the Purbeck area. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) The council notes Wyatt Homes response.
- d) See council response at Paragraph 52. b) of this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 29: Chapter 4 Housing, Trajectory

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

102. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:
- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification (in reference to the housing trajectory) is undeliverable (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).
 - b) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is not legally compliant and suggests that housing delivery should be skewed toward the end of the plan period to reflect when the need for homes is likely to arise. Respondent also notes that focusing growth in 2028 is likely to create pollution and deter tourists (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).
 - c) The respondent considers that traffic linked to proposed housing allocation at Wool will leave the village noisy, polluted, and unattractive (Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

103. Respondents have suggested the following changes:
- a) N/A
 - b) N/A
 - c) The respondent suggests that the housing delivery trajectory should be amended to reflect anticipated demand for homes at the end of the plan period that they consider will be linked to cumulative increases in population during this period (Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).

Council Response

104. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.
- a) The council notes the respondent's comments. The data presented in the housing trajectory is based upon the council's monitoring on the numbers of homes delivered each year and the forecasts of future delivery information provided by site promoters, landowners, developers, allocations in local plan and neighbourhood plans, the assessments of small sites in its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and its records of previous rates of delivery. Taking account of relevant evidence (including that presented in the

council's latest 5-year housing land supply report, SMMCD4⁶) the council is satisfied that the trajectory provides a robust forecast of housing delivery based on the best information currently available. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

- b) The council notes the respondent's comments. The assessment of local housing need shows an annual need for homes over the local plan period to 2034. Whilst noting that estimated rates of delivery are likely to fluctuate over this period, with forecast peaks in delivery during 2026/27, 2027/28 and 2028/29, the council is satisfied that the trajectory demonstrates that new homes will continue to be delivered over the whole plan period from different sources of supply and that these homes will contribute toward meeting local housing needs. Monitoring connected with the application of the housing delivery test will ensure that this issue is reviewed on annual basis over the local plan period. The council's preferred development strategy (referred to as 'Option A' in the New Homes for Purbeck Consultation held in 2018) seeks to spread development as widely as possible across Purbeck. The neighbourhood plan housing allocations are also spread between Bere Regis and Wareham. Consequently, any disruption (the council is confident that developers will have the opportunity to manage site specific delivery to avoid most, if not all, disruption) connected with the delivery of new homes is likely to be less severe as it will not be concentrated in a single location. The council anticipates the new homes will be delivered from several different sources of supply which will be spread spatially across the Purbeck area. The council does not accept the respondent's assertion that the delivery of homes in accordance with the housing trajectory is likely to deter tourists and notes that separate regulatory regimes will allow pollution connected with development to be monitored to ensure any requirements are satisfied. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) The council notes the respondent's comments. The Main Modification (SMM29) specifically relates to forecast rates of housing delivery from different sources over the local plan period to 2034. It does not specifically relate to the proposed housing allocation at Wool (Policy H5). For this reason, the council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main

⁶ For example:

- Forecast numbers of unplanned (or windfall development) numbers of homes (based on previous rates of delivery from this source and taking account of emerging local plan policies, including the small sites policy H8 and exceptions sites policy H11);
- Whether planning permission has been given for a site;
- Proposals to allocate development through the emerging local plan or allocations made through adopted local or neighbourhood plans;
- Evidence of firm progress towards submission of a planning application (site assessment work);
- Clear relevant information about site viability or ownership constraints.

Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also the council's response at paragraph 43. c) of this consultation response document in respect to the suitability of the proposed housing allocation at Wool. The council has also gathered and considered evidence around traffic flows in Wool (SD103: Wool Transport Strategy and Assessment March 2015 and SD104 Wool Que Length Analysis Technical Note August 2015) as part of the plan making process and interested parties have had the opportunity to raise issues on this evidence at earlier stages in the plan's examination. The council also notes the respondent's suggestion that housing delivery should be skewed to the end of the plan. The council has sought to respond to this issue in its response at paragraph 100. b) above. Taking account of both issues the council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 30: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H2

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

105. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondents consider that the Main Modification is unsound as the proposed allocation at Lytchett Matravers to the east of Wareham Road is unsound (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]) and other housing allocations at Lytchett Matravers are also unsound (Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- b) The respondents considers that the table in Policy H2 should only refer to consented homes and that the reference to unconsented homes is unclear (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09] and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- c) The respondent considers that suitable land is not available at Moreton Station and Wool for development with homes. (The land identified here in allocations would involve extinction of rare species and harm to biodiversity) (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

106. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) The table in policy H2 should only refer to consented homes (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09] and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- c) N/A

Council Response

107. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also the council's response at paragraph 43. b) of this consultation response document in respect to the suitability of the proposed housing allocation at Lytchett Matravers. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondents' comments. The table in Policy H2 (SMM30) and the updated housing delivery trajectory (SMM29) have been prepared to show forecasts of the numbers of homes that the council

anticipates will be delivered from different sources of supply. This necessarily includes the numbers of homes which the council anticipates will be delivered from the emerging Purbeck Local Plan housing allocations which do not yet have planning permission (these have been described as 'unconsented allocations' in the table). Having regard to the purpose of both SMM29 and SMM30 the council does not agree that it would be appropriate to omit those forecast sources of housing land supply. The council is satisfied that the local plan has been both positively prepared and is effective.

- c) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also the council's response at paragraph 43. c) of this consultation response document in respect to the suitability of the proposed housing allocation at Wool. The suitability of the proposed housing allocation at Moreton Station/Redbridge Pit has been similarly reviewed during the local plan's examination. The council considers that both development sites are suitable and available for development with new homes during the local plan period. The council is satisfied that the local plan has been both positively prepared and is effective.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 31: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 118

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

108. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is sound, but not specific enough about carbon footprint, rainwater catchment and building materials (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant as it does not accurately describe progression on the Dorset Council Local Plan (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- c) The respondents consider that the proposed Main Modification is unsound as it does not consider increased flood risks connected with planned development in Wool for existing homes at Purbeck Gate. The respondent considers that drainage infrastructure is inadequate for further planned growth and notes that combined sewer overflows discharges have been made into the River Frome from the waste water treatment works (WWTW) at Wool (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09] and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

109. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) The respondent suggest that the council should cease work on the Purbeck Local Plan (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- c) The respondents suggest that the council should:
 - Not building on or near flood plains,
 - Ensure that new sewers are formed linking development and WWTW;
 - Restrict the use of combined sewers (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09] and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).

Council Response

110. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments. The council is satisfied that the supporting text in the proposed Main Modification to Policy H3 is sound. Policy H3 includes overarching requirements for the local plan housing allocations. The development in the allocations will also be subject to other planning policies in the local plan, national policy and guidance, including

Policy E12 (which references building materials and sustainable construction) and Policy E5 (relating to sustainable drainage systems). The council is satisfied that the Main Modification and local plan is both effective and consistent with national planning policy.

- b) The council notes the respondent's comments which do not appear to specifically relate to the proposed Main Modification. The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also the council's response at paragraph 43. a) of this consultation response document in respect to continuing work with the Purbeck Local Plan following local government reorganisation and in the context of the Dorset Council Local Plan. The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.
- c) The council notes the respondents' comments which do not appear to specifically relate to the proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, the issue of flood risk relating to the proposed housing allocation at Wool has been considered in detail by both the applicant, Lead Local Flood Authority and the council. Paragraphs 19 to 22 and Appendix 2 (a statement of common ground entered into by the Lead Local Flood Authority) of the 'Memorandum of Understanding between: Dorset Council and Savills (on behalf of the owners of the land encompassed in the Wool H5 draft allocation)' demonstrates that the issue of flood risk has been taken into consideration as part of the plan making process. Wessex Water have responsibility for drainage infrastructure and combined sewer overflows into the River Frome. The council has engaged with Wessex Water as part of the plan making process so that they can take planned growth in the proposed allocation into account and invest in their infrastructure accordingly. Wessex Water have not objected to the proposed housing allocation at Wool (see response from Ruth Hall on behalf of Wessex Water (consultee reference: 1190241 and comment identification: PLPP93)). The council remains satisfied that the local plan and proposed Main Modification has been justified, is effective and is consistent with national planning policy.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 32: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H3

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

111. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant, as development is likely to lead to a decline in biodiversity (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant. To make the proposed plan legal Purbeck/Dorset Council need to prove explicitly, with an updated search for land, not Green Belt land, that there are no alternatives to removing land from Green Belt. Habitat site mitigation is not effective for proposed housing allocations (SANG too small and poorly located relative to development - no reference to Poole Harbour recreation mitigation) (Goretti Quin-Bagley [SMMR22]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

112. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) Biodiversity needs to be much more thoroughly considered to make the local plan sound (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- b) N/A

Council Response

113. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments. The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, the council has taken account of the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy in the plan making process and in those policies in the emerging local plan (Policy E10: Biodiversity and geodiversity). These policies directly reference the need to consider biodiversity. In addition to planning policies in the emerging local plan, the requirement for net gains in biodiversity as defined in the Environment Act (2021) and emerging regulations will also start to take effect when considering new development proposals submitted after 12 February 2024. The council is satisfied that its local plan is consistent with national planning policy and legally compliant.

- b) The council notes the respondent's comments. The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding this, the council has outlined its position on the issues raised by the respondent elsewhere in this consultation response document (e.g. at paragraph 43. a) and paragraph 70. b)). In accordance with the findings in the addendum to the Habitats Regulation Assessment the council is satisfied that the Main Modifications and local plan is both legally compliant and sound.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 38: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H5

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

114. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant as it does not recognise the biodiversity of land at Wool or lack of infrastructure at Wool to support growth (including new school and wastewater treatment works). The respondent considers that the proposed SANG at Coombe Wood, Wool will compromise the role of functionally linked habitats connected with habitat sites (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- b) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant for the following reasons:
 - Part of land to the north of the A352 is subject to flooding (development south of the A352 will exacerbate this issue) and is inhabited by great crested newts;
 - Further traffic will exacerbate local issues arising from closure of the level crossing;
 - Nutrient pollution of the River Frome is not mentioned;
 - There is no references to protecting hedgerows;
 - Proposed Coombe Wood SANG at Wool is unsuitable (defined as PAWS and the proposed use as SANG will adversely effect this asset).
 - There are not sufficient jobs/facilities/services in Wool to meet the needs from planned development (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09] and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- c) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because the:
 - Proposed Coombe Wood SANG on PAWS would be inconsistent with national planning policy relating to irreplaceable habitats. Increasing recreational activity in an irreplaceable habitat would neither conserve or enhance the natural environment in accordance with national planning policy.
 - Forming a SANG at Coombe Wood would be inconsistent with the advice in the Dorset Heaths Supplementary Planning Document which suggests that SANGs should not be formed on land with a high nature conservation value (Amanda Marler [SMMR13]).
- d) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant because:
 - The policy does not clearly set limits on the numbers of homes permitted through the allocation (the respondent opposes changes to introduce the word 'around' as a prefix for the anticipated numbers of homes delivered from each site).

- The policy should stipulate that the proposed Coombe Wood SANG should be open before any new homes are occupied (the respondent opposes the suggestion that delivery should be carried out in accordance with a phased implementation of development);
- It is unclear how use of the Coombe Wood SANG can be managed to avoid harm to biodiversity (including priority species - Woodcock and Dormice);
- Coombe Wood SANG will not operate effectively and will not therefore provide mitigation for Dorset Heaths habitat sites (the change in use would also be inconsistent with national planning policy relating to irreplicable habitats) (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

115. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) Respondent suggests that the council should reduce the level of planned growth at Wool (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09] and Barry Shephard [SMMR12]).
- c) Respondent suggests that the council should re-locate the SANG to a less environmentally sensitive area (Amanda Marler [SMMR13]).
- d) Respondent suggests that the proposed housing allocation at Wool and the Coombe Wood SANG are both omitted from the local plan (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).

Council Response

116. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the response but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also the response at paragraph 43. c) and paragraph 70. d) of this consultation response document regarding the suitability of the proposed housing allocation at Wool and the proposed Coombe Wood SANG. The suitability of strategies and policies in the emerging local plan have also been iteratively assessed throughout the plan making process through Habitats Regulations Assessment (including the latest addendum to the Habitats Regulation Assessment SMMCD2). The council remains satisfied that both the Main Modification is legally compliant and consistent with national planning policy.
- b) The council notes the response but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also the response at paragraph 43. c), paragraph 70. d) and paragraph 106. c) of this consultation response document regarding the suitability of the proposed housing allocation at Wool and the proposed Coombe Wood SANG. In respect to traffic flows through the village the council has also sought to gather and take account of relevant evidence on this issue (SD103: Wool Transport Strategy and Assessment March 2015 and SD104 Wool Que Length Analysis Technical Note August 2015). The council remains satisfied that both the Main Modification, and local plan, is legally compliant and consistent with national planning policy.

- c) The council notes the response but considers that these issues fall outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also the response at paragraph 70. d) of this consultation response document regarding the suitability of the proposed housing allocation at Wool and the proposed Coombe Wood SANG. The council remains satisfied that both the Main Modification, and local plan, is legally compliant and consistent with national planning policy.
- d) The council notes the response but considers that these issues fall outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also the response at paragraph 52. b) and paragraph 70. d) of this consultation response document regarding the suitability of the proposed housing allocation at Wool and the proposed Coombe Wood SANG. The council remains satisfied that both the Main Modification, and local plan as a whole, is legally compliant and consistent with national planning policy.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 40: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H6

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

117. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is sound but notes a missed opportunity around connecting Lytchett Matravers with the secondary school in Lytchett Minster through a cycle way and footpath (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).
- b) The respondents consider that the Main Modification is unsound because the proposed Flowers Drove SANG at Lytchett Matravers is too small, poorly location relative to planned housing (Namoi Pickard [SMMR05]), is already accessible to the public and is likely to generate traffic along an unsuitable road (Deirdre Flegg [SMMR18]).
- c) The respondents consider that the proposed Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant. Notwithstanding the respondent's position on the local plan they also comment that they do not agree with the layouts for the homes in planning applications for development submitted by Wyatt Homes (the respondent is not clear whether their comments relate to the application for the land to the east of Wareham Road or the land at Blaney's Corner). The respondent suggests that the layout for development should be based on development briefs prepared in consultation with the local community. The respondent also suggests that development should fund delivery of active travel routes toward Poole (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07] and Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor, Alf Bush [SMMR11]).
- d) Wyatt Homes supports the policy and is committed to the delivery of homes and SANG at Lytchett Matravers. The sites will make a significant contribution to housing land supply in Purbeck area. Planning applications have been submitted for two of the sites and are awaiting determination. Wyatt Homes is also committed to the delivery of the Flowers Drove SANG which is expected early in 2024 (Philip Saunders, Wyatt Homes [SMMR10]).
- e) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant because the council has not completed an updated search for land, not Green Belt land, and demonstrated that there are no alternatives to removing land from Green Belt, the habitat site mitigation is not effective for proposed housing allocations (SANG too small and poorly located relative to development) and because the policy makes no reference to Poole Harbour recreation mitigation (Goretti Quinn-Bagley [SMMR22]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

118. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The SANG and related housing allocation for Lytchett Matravers should be omitted from the local plan (Deirdre Flegg [SMMR18]).
- b) N/A
- c) N/A
- d) N/A
- e) N/A

Council Response

119. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the response but considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, it notes that requirement b. of Policy H6 states that it expects development at the housing sites would: 'improve accessibility in Lytchett Matravers by forming or improving walking and cycling routes within the village or its immediate surroundings. Off-site improvements can be delivered through financial contributions and/or physical works'. The policy drafting would support delivery of connecting cycle ways or footpaths between Lytchett Matravers and Lytchett Minster. The council remains satisfied that both the Main Modification, and the local plan as a whole, is justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy.
- b) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, please also see paragraphs 58. e) and 70. b) of this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that both the Main Modification, and the local plan, is consistent with national planning policy and legally compliant.
- c) The council notes the respondents' position on the Main Modification and their suggestions for revisions to the layouts in submitted planning applications and the call for development to fund transport infrastructure. The council considers that these issues fall outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, it considers that Policy H6 does include a requirement to fund transport infrastructure and the planning application process gives respondents the opportunity to comment on proposals (including layout) and engage with the developer around revisions to layout). The council remains satisfied that the Main Modification, and local plan as a whole, is both effective and consistent with national planning policy.
- d) The council notes the response from Wyatt Homes.

- e) The council notes the respondent's comments. It considers that the issues raised fall outside the scope of this consultation as they do not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, please also see paragraphs 43. a), 58. e) and 70. b) of this consultation response document. The council also notes that the requirements of Policy E9: Poole Harbour in respect to recreational impacts of development on Poole Harbour would need to be taken into consideration in addition to the requirement in Policy H3: New housing development requirement, c. which relates to 'New Housing development on allocated sites identified in policies H4 to H7...'. The council remains satisfied that both the Main Modification, and the local plan, is consistent with national planning policy and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 42: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 148 and 149 (insertions and deletions)

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

120. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the Main Modification is unsound and not legally compliant as the strategy is not justified (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- b) The respondent notes that there is typo 'in cumulative' in the final paragraph of the proposed Main Modification (Dr A Langley [SMMR08]).
- c) The respondent criticises the council's development strategy (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

121. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A
- c) N/A

Council Response

122. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council considers that this issue falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, please also see the council's response to the Inspector Doward's Matters, Issues and Questions (specifically those questions relating to Matter D, The strategy for development, Issue 1: Spatial Strategy), its Housing background paper [SD19], its Settlement Strategy Update 2017 [SD65] and its Site Selection Background Paper 2018 [SD58]. The council remains satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and its local plan as a whole, are both justified, consistent with national planning policy and legally compliant.
- b) Council notes respondent's comments and will consider a further additional modification to the local plan to address the typographical error which has been identified.
- c) Council notes respondent's comment, but for the reasons outlined at paragraph 118. a) above it remains satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and its local plan, are both justified, consistent with national planning policy and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 43: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H8

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

123. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is not legally compliant, in particular the references to habitats regulations assessments in Policy H8 are inconsistent with the form and effect of other policies elsewhere in the local plan (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).
- b) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because:
 - The scope of the small sites policy should be extended to include Green Belt;
 - The aims of small sites policy are consistent with the aims of Green Belt (preventing urban sprawl, preventing encroachment of the countryside and securing the permanence of the Green Belt) (Ian Taylor [SMMR19]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

124. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The respondent suggests that the council should omit the housing allocation for Wool and the Coombe Wood SANG from the local plan (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).
- b) The respondent suggest that the scope of the policy should be extended to Green Belt with a limitation on the total numbers of small sites permitted around any single settlement (Ian Taylor [SMMR19]).

Council Response

125. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but is satisfied that the requirements of Policy H8 are consistent with the legislative requirements in The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. The Proposed Supplementary Main Modifications, and earlier drafts of the local plan, have also been subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment (the latest is an addendum to earlier assessments: SMMCD2). This iterative assessment process has allowed the council to refine and finalise the drafting of policies to ensure their effectiveness and consistency with relevant laws. The change suggested by the respondent does not appear

to be related to Policy H8. The council is satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and the local plan, are effective and legally compliant with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.

b) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issues fall outside the scope of this consultation as they do not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, the scope of Policy H8 has been carefully considered and drafted to reflect national planning policy relating to Green Belt which states that:

- 'proposals for changes [*to Green Belt boundaries*] should be made only through the plan-making process...' (Text in italics inserted by the council). (Paragraph 145. National Planning Policy Framework).
- 'A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt.' (Paragraph 154. National Planning Policy Framework). Paragraph 154. then goes onto list exceptions to this general position which include replacement buildings (154. d)), limited infilling in villages (154. e)), and limited affordable housing (154. f)).
- 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.' (Paragraph 152. National Planning Policy Framework).

The council is satisfied that national planning policy, and local plan policies relating to the general location of development, provide an appropriate framework for considering proposals for housing development in the Green Belt. The council is satisfied that Policy H8 is consistent with national planning policy and effective.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 46: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H10

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

126. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound, Historic England suggests that the exceptions to the application of the requirements for accessible and adaptable homes should also be applied to all other unallocated development, in addition to those allocations in neighbourhood plans (Kim Miller, Historic England [SMMR16]).
- b) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because climate matters require local plans to be sound by expecting buildings to be well insulated and not require the use of fossil fuels when in use. Suitable provisions around using solar panels on roofs should be added to any sound plan from Dorset Council (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

127. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A

Council Response

128. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comment but considers that the issues fall outside the scope of this consultation as they do not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. The changes which Historic England have made representation on were presented as part of MM46. As with MM1, the Main Modifications were made to give discretion to local communities to develop their own local policies as part of the neighbourhood plan making process. The council is satisfied that this proposed Main Modification, and the local plan is both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondent's comments but does not consider that they are directly relevant to the Policy H10: Accessible and adaptable homes. The council is satisfied that this proposed Main Modification, and the local plan as a whole is both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 47: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H11

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

129. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent suggests that builders should stop building second homes and that there is a need for affordable homes for local people (Roger Starbuck [SMMR02]).
- b) The respondent suggests that the proposed Main Modification is unsound as the evidence relating to the brownfield register seems to be missing (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

130. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A

Council Response

131. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments which appear to principally relate to both Policy H14: Second homes and Policy H11: Affordable housing. Policy H14 will limit how new homes are occupied to avoid occupation as 'second homes'. The requirement is limited and qualified by several policy terms. Policies H11 will deliver new affordable homes in Purbeck alongside Policy H12: Rural exception sites. The council is satisfied that this proposed Main Modification and the local plan as a whole is both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondent's comments. The first table in Policy H11 outlines separate requirements for affordable housing according to whether a development site is 'Greenfield' or 'Brownfield'. The policy does not expressly relate to the council's brownfield land register per se. The term 'brownfield' is defined in the local plan's glossary and in the term 'previously developed land' is also defined in the glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework. The council does not consider that its brownfield register is directly relevant to the application of Policy H11. The council is satisfied that this proposed Main Modification and the local plan as a whole is both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 48: Chapter 4 Housing, title before paragraph 170 (deletion)

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

132. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent suggests that 'local homes' should be built for local people with covenants to restrict their occupation (Roger Starbuck [SMMR02]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

133. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A

Council Response

134. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments which appear to relate to both rural exceptions sites and Policy H14: Second homes. Policy H14 will limit how new homes are occupied to avoid occupation as 'second homes'. The requirement is limited and qualified by several policy terms. The council is satisfied that this proposed Main Modification and the local plan as a whole is both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 49: Chapter 4 Housing, paragraphs 171 and 172 (alterations, insertions and deletions)

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

135. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent suggests that the council should not let developers circumvent local needs for profit (Roger Starbuck [SMM02]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

136. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A

Council Response

137. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, the respondent has made comment on the text in Policy H12 which in turn sets out an objective process that allows the council to consider and review viability evidence for different tenure mixes of homes on rural exception sites. The policy states:

'If any market housing is proposed to facilitate delivery of affordable homes the applicant must demonstrate, through a viability assessment, that the number of market homes is restricted to the minimum required to facilitate delivery of the proposed affordable homes. Rural exception sites must primarily provide affordable housing. The applicant will be expected to fund the independent verification of the submitted viability assessment by a person appointed by the Council.'

The council is satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and local plan as whole, is effective and consistent with national planning policy.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 52: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H12

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

138. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent suggests that the council should not let developers use incorrect figures to prove projects are not viable (Roger Starbuck [SMM02]).
- b) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because criteria g) is unclear. The respondent goes onto suggest that the numbers of market homes should be the smallest necessary (limiting their numbers, but also their sizes and values) (Dr A Langley [SMMR08]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

139. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A

Council Response

140. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, Policy H12 states that viability assessments undertaken by applicant will be subject to independent review undertaken by a person appointed by the council. This process should ensure that decisions are taken based on accurate information that has been independently considered by a third party. The council is satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and local plan, is effective and consistent with national planning policy.
- b) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, Policy H12 does state that the 'number of market homes is restricted to the minimum required to facilitate delivery of the proposed affordable homes'. Any viability evidence prepared to justify the mix of different tenures of homes on a rural exceptions site will necessarily take account of the value of the proposed market homes. The council is not aware

of evidence which would justify further restrictions on the size and value of market homes on rural exceptions sites. The council is satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and local plan as a whole, is effective and consistent with national planning policy.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 54: Chapter 4 Housing, Policy H13

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

141. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondents consider that the proposed Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant because it will be 'abused' to allow rural workers homes on Green Belt land around Lytchett Matravers. Agricultural permitted development rights have been also been 'abused' to allow development in the Green Belt (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07] and Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor Alf Bush [SMMR11]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

142. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The respondent suggests that the council should apply an Article 4 direction restricting agricultural permitted development rights that allow changes in use from agriculture to dwelling houses (Mandy Backhouse [SMMR07] and Lytchett Matravers Parish Councillor Alf Bush [SMMR11]).

Council Response

143. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondents' comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, it appears that respondents have conflated the regulations which define 'permitted development rights' with those instances where an applicant might seek planning permission for a new rural worker's home in the Green Belt. Green Belt policy in the National Planning Policy Framework would need to be taken into consideration alongside Policy H13 when the council conducts its assessment of a planning application for a new rural worker's home in the Green Belt. Furthermore, there is no scope to make Article 4 directions directly through the local plan making process. The council is satisfied that the proposed Main Modification is consistent with national planning policy and effective.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 63: Chapter 5 Economy, Policy EE2

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

144. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant because it is unclear whether Dorset Innovation Park will deliver jobs which in turn avoid unsustainable travel from planned homes in Wool (Dr A C Warn [SMMR06]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

145. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A

Council Response

146. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, the respondent's comments do not appear to directly relate to any Main Modifications on Policy EE2. Instead, they seem to relate to the issue of whether Wool is a sustainable location for new homes. The council's response at Paragraph 43. c) of this document highlights relevant evidence relating to this issue. At the time of preparing this consultation response Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership website indicates that there are currently 36 companies based at Dorset Innovation Park, that some 8,654 square metres of commercial floor space has been created or refurbished and that 794 jobs have been created/safeguarded (source: [Dorset Innovation Park | Dorset LEP](#), as of January 2024). The council remains satisfied that this Main Modification and the local plan are both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 65: Chapter 5 Economy, Policy EE3

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

147. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because planned housing growth and retail provision proposed for Wool exceeds that required by the local community. Retail allocations could threaten existing local businesses. New homes and retail development should reflect what is needed by the local community (Wendy Riddle [SMMR09]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

148. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A

Council Response

149. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, evidence (Poole and Purbeck Town Centres, Retail and Leisure Study, final report, November 2014 [SD27a]) has been presented as part of the local plan's examination which justifies the proposed allocations for retail development at Wool (Policy H5) and Moreton Station/Redbridge Pit (Policy H4). The council is satisfied that both the proposed Main Modification, and the local plan, is justified and consistent with national planning policy.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 66: Chapter 5 Economy, Policy EE4

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

150. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound as it does not include a definition of 'caravan park'. The respondent notes the issue of park homes being occupied permanently as a main residence in the Green Belt (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

151. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The respondent suggests that Policy EE4 is amended to define caravan parks and their role in the local economy (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).

Council Response

152. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, the terms 'caravan' and 'caravan site' are defined in legislation through the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and Caravan Sites Act 1968. The council remains satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and local plan, is effective and consistent with national planning policy.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 68: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, paragraph 230 (insertion)

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

153. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound as planning obligations are not an effective means of gathering contributions from developers because development is subject to the requirement for viability (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

154. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The respondent suggests that the Main Modification clarifies the definition of low cost housing - say below 60% of market rent (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Council Response

155. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, the respondent's comments do not appear to relate to the text in the Main Modification which refers to supplementary planning documents. The council is satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and local plan, is sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 76: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, paragraphs 256 and 257

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

156. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent notes that the proposed Main Modifications provide a more 'defendable position' for the local plan, allowing the proposed strategic SANG and Morden Holiday park to be considered separately. The respondent suggests that this is likely to increase in scrutiny of holiday park proposals (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).
- b) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because the proposed Flowers Drove SANG at Lytchett Matravers is unsuitable (too small and poorly located), and would not therefore act effectively in diverting recreational pressure away from Dorset Heaths (Naomi Pickard [SMMR05]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

157. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A

Council Response

158. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. The council remains satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and the local plan as whole, is both sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, please also see paragraphs 58. e) and 70. b) of this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that both the Main Modification, and the local plan, is consistent with national planning policy and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 77: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, Policy I5

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

159. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound, because:
 - There have been a number of car accidents at the junction of Morden Park Corner (onto the A35) where the strategic Morden SANG is likely to be accessed from, and the respondent suggests that further vehicular traffic would exacerbate these issues;
 - The SANG is subject to flooding (Deirdre Flegg [SMMR18]).
- b) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because SANGs damage biodiversity and can introduce vermin. Siting a SANG at Morden is unsound (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

160. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A

Council Response

161. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, evidence has been presented around the suitability of the land at Morden for use as a strategic SANG through the course of the local plan's examination. The proposed SANG, and its entrance/car parking, would be set back (over 1km) from the junction between the A35 and the B3075 which is described in the respondent's comments⁷. The majority of the proposed strategic SANG's area is not affected by flood risk, aside from a small areas around its southern (next to the River Sherford), western boundaries and northern boundaries which are subject to surface

⁷ The council also notes that planning permission has been given to 'Create new agricultural and forestry access' (6/2011/0476) close to the junction between the A35 and the B3075.

water and fluvial flood risks. The extent of flooding would not compromise the use of the land as a SANG and the council has received support from Natural England around the suitability of the site for this purpose. The council remains satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and the local plan, is both legally compliant and sound.

- b) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, see also responses at Paragraphs 55. d) and 70. f) of this consultation response document. The council remains satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and the local plan is both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 87: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, paragraphs 263 to 265

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

162. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because the issue of access to emergency medicine/health care for the residents of Swanage has not been addressed (Gerald Rigler, CPRE [SMMR20]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

163. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A

Council Response

164. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, Integrated Care Systems (ICSs) (formed from NHS organisations and upper-tier local councils) through integrated care partnerships are responsible for local health care services. The council has engaged with local health services as part of the plan making process to ensure that any spatial land use considerations have been considered. The council is satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and the local plan, is both sound and legally compliant.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 81: Chapter 6 Infrastructure, Policy I7

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

165. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because it does not reference development outside development boundaries in the Green Belt (Dr A Langley [SMMR08]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

166. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) The respondent suggests that a condition about development in the Green Belt should be added (Dr A Langley [SMMR08]).

Council Response

167. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on this issue, the National Planning Policy Framework provides Green Belt policy which should be applied by local councils when taking decisions on planning applications. The council does not consider that there is a need for a further local plan policy on this issue. The council is satisfied that both the proposed Main Modification, and the local plan, is both effective and consistent with national planning policy.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (SMM) 82: Chapter 7 Implementation delivery and monitoring, monitoring framework

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

168. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant because the monitoring strategy for biodiversity not effective (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).
- b) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is unsound because the monitoring requirements for Poole Harbour are weak. The respondent suggests that nutrient concentrations should be regularly reviewed to assess the effectiveness of mitigation measures and progress on the application of nutrient pollution standards should be monitored (Dr A Langley [SMMR-8]).
- c) The respondent considers that the proposed Main Modification is both unsound and not legally compliant because:
 - The monitoring framework does not provide an effective means of assessing and reviewing impacts on biodiversity and protected habitats and species;
 - The local plan does not give sufficient weight to biodiversity as a consideration; and
 - Wool and the surrounding area is particularly biodiverse and subject to a number of designations (Special Protection Area heathland and River Frome Site Special Scientific Interest), and the proposed housing allocation at Wool is inconsistent with 'mitigation hierarchy' in national planning policy (i.e. avoidance, mitigation and compensation) (Rachel Palmer, Wool Flora and Fauna [SMMR17]).

Changes which the respondent considers are necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound

169. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) The respondent suggests that following should be monitored:
 - Nutrient concentrations;
 - Combined sewer overflows; and
 - Improvements to WWTW (Dr A Langley [SMMR-8]).
- c) N/A

Council Response

170. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy

and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issue raised falls outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification (no changes are proposed through Main Modifications to the monitoring strategy relating to Policy E10). The council remains satisfied that both the proposed Main Modifications, and the local plan as a whole, are sound and legally compliant.
- b) The council notes the respondent's comments, but the requirement in Policy E9 is for development to demonstrate compliance with 'the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 or any equivalent relevant legislation or regulations. If required, this may include the provision of appropriate avoidance/mitigation measures to ensure development is 'nutrient neutral' and that the development would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Poole Harbour SPA, SSSI and Ramsar site due to increased nutrient loading.' The council considers that the monitoring provisions outlined in SMM82 in respect to the delivery of nutrient mitigation measures are sufficient to ensure the effectiveness of Policy E9. The council considers that the respondent's suggestions for wider monitoring in respect to nutrient concentrations, combined sewer overflows and improvements to WWTW go beyond the scope of what is necessary to ensure the local plan policy remains effective. The processing and discharge of treated wastewater are also subject to separate legislative permitting regimes and monitoring. The nutrient pollution standards in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 are put forward as an amendment to the Water Industry Act 1991. The council does not consider that it would be appropriate to duplicate monitoring requirements arising from other legislation in its local plan. The council is satisfied that the proposed Main Modification, and the local plan, is both legally compliant and sound.
- c) The council notes the respondent's comments but considers that the issues raised fall outside the scope of this consultation as it does not expressly relate to a novel Supplementary Proposed Main Modification. Notwithstanding the council's position on these issues, it has responded to the issue of monitoring biodiversity (see response at Paragraph 166. a) above) and the other matters raised by the respondent do not appear to directly relate to the proposed Main Modifications in SMM82 or have been considered elsewhere in this report. The council is satisfied that both the proposed Main Modification, and the local plan, is both sound and legally compliant.

Addendum to Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) (SMMCD2)

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

171. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) The respondent considers that the HRA does not:
 - Properly consider nutrient pollution issue (in particular it does not reference the effectiveness of mitigation measures for land use change and suggests no control on intensive livestock rearing); and
 - Provides no justification for treating Corfe Common differently from Special Protection Area heaths) (Dr A C Warne [SMMR06]).

Changes suggested by the respondent

172. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A

Council Response

173. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) The council notes the respondent's comments, but does not agree with his conclusions for the following reasons:
 - Policy E9 of the local plan, in conjunction with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 sets out a robust framework for screening for likely significant effects and conducting appropriate assessments. The local plan does not prescribe a specific approach to mitigation, rather it anticipates that different approaches to mitigation will be developed and delivered through projects. The effectiveness of different approaches to mitigate will be determined through project level appropriate assessments.
 - The implications of the SMM relating to Corfe Common are expressly considered through the addendum to the HRA (SMMCD2) at paragraphs 4.5 to 4.7. As part this paragraph 4.7 of the HRA explicitly justifies the approach at Corfe Common as follow:

'Corfe Common is not part of the Dorset Heathlands SPA and does not hold notable populations of heathland bird species, it is also less vulnerable to fire compared to drier areas of the Dorset Heaths that support more typical heathland vegetation. The different approach is therefore justified. No actual allocations or level of growth within 400m of the site are proposed within the Plan.'

The council remains satisfied that the local plan is legally compliant with The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.

Inset maps for Wareham and Bere Regis

Summary of matters / issues raised in responses

174. The council received responses relating to this Supplementary Proposed Main Modification raising the following matters / issues:

- a) Inset Map for Wareham – The respondent considers that the map is logical (Dorset Council Councillor, Alex Brenton [SMMR03]).
- b) Inset Map for Bere Regis – The respondent states that Wyatt Homes support the proposed changes to the inset map for Bere Regis (Philip Saunders, Wyatt Homes [SMMR10]).

Changes suggested by the respondent

175. Respondents have suggested the following changes:

- a) N/A
- b) N/A

Council Response

176. The council has sought to respond to the matters / issues raised in responses by drawing the Inspector's attention to published evidence and national policy and guidance. Where appropriate it has also indicated where it considers it might be appropriate to consider revision to a proposed Main Modification.

- a) Council notes comments.
- b) Council notes comments.

Appendix 1 – Consultation response form



Response form for: Purbeck Local Plan Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications consultation

This form is for making representations on the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications to the Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034)

The council has opened a consultation into Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications (SMM) published as part of the Consolidated schedule of Main Modifications (SMMCD1) to the Purbeck Local Plan. The council is only accepting comments on the novel supplementary modification and not any earlier modifications which have already been presented as Main Modifications or Further Proposed Main Modifications. This is not an opportunity to raise matters relating to other parts of the Plan that have already been considered by the Inspector during the examination. Weight will not be given to representations that repeat matters that have previously been raised and discussed at hearing sessions or in earlier responses.

Alongside SMM, there is also an opportunity to comment on updated policies maps, the Habitats Regulation Assessment Addendum and Sustainability Appraisal Addendum. The council has also published supporting evidence relating to the SMM, comprising a five-year housing land supply report and an assessment of local housing need.

These documents can be found on-line at www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/plpmainmods .

Once the consultation is closed at 11:45pm on 22 December 2022, the council will prepare a summary of the issues raised in representations to the consultation and provide its response. The council's summary, and full copies of the representations, will then be sent to the Planning Inspectors for their consideration. The Inspectors will then make a recommendation around the next stages of the local plan's examination taking account of the issues raised in the representations.

PART A

	Your contact details	Agent's Details (if applicable)
Name	e)	f)
Organisation / Group (if applicable)	g)	h)
Address line 1	i)	j)
Address line 2	k)	l)
Town / City	m)	n)
County	o)	p)
Post Code	q)	r)
E-mail address	s)	t)

Group Representations

If your representation is on behalf of a group, ensure the lead representative completes the contact details box above. Also, please state here how many people supports the representation.

Please note:

- The consultation period starts on **10 November 2023** and will last for 6 weeks until 11.45pm on **22 December 2023**.
- Only representations made in this period will be referred to the Planning Inspectors for consideration.
- Responses must be made using this form (sent in the post or attached to an e-mail).
- Respondents must complete Part A of this response form and separate Part B forms for each Supplementary Proposed Main Modification that they might wish to comment on.
- All respondents must provide their name and address and/or email address.
- All forms must be signed and dated.
- Responses cannot be treated as confidential. By making a response you agree to your name and comments being made available for public viewing.
- Information on the council's privacy policy is available on our website at: <https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/your-council/about-your-council/data-protection/dorset-council-general-privacy-notice.aspx> .

- The council will not accept any responsibility for the contents of comments submitted. We reserve the right to remove any comments containing defamatory, abusive or malicious allegations.
- If you are part of a group that shares a common view, please include a list of the contact details of each person (including names, addresses, emails, telephone numbers and signatures) along with a completed form providing details of the named lead representative.
- The supplementary proposed main modifications, the updated policies map, the Habitats Regulation Assessment Addendum and Sustainability Appraisal Addendum, are available to view on the Council's website at www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/plpmainmods. Paper copies of the supplementary proposed main modifications, the updated policies map, the Habitats Regulation Assessment Addendum and Sustainability Appraisal Addendum are available to consult at libraries in Dorchester, Corfe Castle, Lytchett Matravers, Swanage, Upton, Wareham, Wool and Poole.
- If you have questions relating to the consultation, or the process for making a response, please contact the Planning Policy team on 01305 838334 or planningpolicy@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk.
- Response forms returned in the post should reference the **Purbeck Local Plan, Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications Consultation, and be sent to Spatial Planning Team, County Hall, Colliton Park, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ**. Forms can be returned by email, referencing Purbeck Local Plan Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications Consultation, to the email above.
- Please tick the box if you would like to be notified of the following:

Adoption of the Local Plan.

PART B

1. Which Supplementary Proposed Main Modification does your representation relate to?

Separate Part B forms must be completed for each separate Supplementary Proposed Main Modification you wish to comment on.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications reference number	
---	--

2. Do you consider that the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification is:

Legally compliant	Yes		No	
Sound	Yes		No	

To be considered legally compliant the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications must:

- comply with the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019; and
- be appraised for their sustainability.

To be considered sound the local plan as a whole must be:

- positively prepared - **providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs;**
- justified - **an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;**
- effective - **deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and**
- consistent with national policy - **enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework.**

Some or all of these considerations of soundness may be relevant to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification[s] that you are seeking to make a representation on.

3. Please give details of why you consider the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification is / is not legally compliant or sound. (Please be as precise as possible).

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

4. Having regard to your comments in question 3, please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording and where appropriate provide evidence necessary to support/justify the representation. (Please be as precise as possible)

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

PART B

1. Which Supplementary Proposed Main Modification does your representation relate to?

Separate Part B forms must be completed for each separate proposed Main Modification you wish to comment on.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications reference number	
---	--

2. Do you consider that the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification is:

Legally compliant	Yes		No	
Sound	Yes		No	

To be considered legally compliant the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications must:

- comply with the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019; and
- be appraised for their sustainability.

To be considered sound the local plan as a whole must be:

- positively prepared - **providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs;**
- justified - **an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;**
- effective - **deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground;** and
- consistent with national policy - **enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework.**

Some or all of these considerations of soundness may be relevant to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification[s] that you are seeking to make a representation on.

3. Please give details of why you consider the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification is / is not legally compliant or sound. (Please be as precise as possible).

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

4. Having regard to your comments in question 3, please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording and where appropriate provide evidence necessary to support/justify the representation. (Please be as precise as possible)

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

PART B

1. Which Supplementary Proposed Main Modification does your representation relate to?

Separate Part B forms must be completed for each separate Supplementary Proposed Main Modification you wish to comment on.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications reference number	
---	--

2. Do you consider that the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification is:

Legally compliant	Yes		No	
Sound	Yes		No	

To be considered legally compliant the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification must:

- comply with the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019; and
- be appraised for their sustainability.

To be considered sound the local plan as a whole must be:

- positively prepared - **providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs;**
- justified - **an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;**
- effective - **deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and**
- consistent with national policy - **enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework.**

Some, or all, of these considerations of soundness may be relevant to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification[s] that you are seeking to make a representation on.

3. Please give details of why you consider the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification is / is not legally compliant or sound. (Please be as precise as possible).

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

4. Having regard to your comments in question 3, please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording and where appropriate provide evidence necessary to support/justify the representation. (Please be as precise as possible)

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

PART B

1. Which Supplementary Proposed Main Modification does your representation relate to?

Separate Part B forms must be completed for each separate Supplementary Proposed Main Modification you wish to comment on.

Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications reference number	
---	--

2. Do you consider that the proposed Main Modification is:

Legally compliant	Yes		No	
Sound	Yes		No	

To be considered legally compliant the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications must:

- comply with the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019; and
- be appraised for their sustainability.

To be considered sound the local plan as a whole must be:

- positively prepared - **providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs;**
- justified - **an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;**
- effective - **deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and**
- consistent with national policy - **enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework.**

Some or all of these considerations of soundness may be relevant to the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification[s] that you are seeking to make a representation on.

3. Please give details of why you consider the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification is / is not legally compliant or sound. (Please be as precise as possible).

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

4. Having regard to your comments in question 3, please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Supplementary Proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording and where appropriate provide evidence necessary to support/justify the representation. (Please be as precise as possible)

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

PART C

1. Comments on updated policies map, SA or HRA.

Separate Part C forms must be completed for each appraisal or evidence document commented upon, making clear the section or paragraph you're referring to

Document:	
------------------	--

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

Please sign and date this form:	
Signature:	Date:

Appendix 2 - Notification letter for consultation on proposed Main Modifications

Address

Date: 7 November 2023

Ref: PLP/SMM

Officer:



Dear Sir/Madam

Purbeck Local Plan Further Proposed Main Modifications Consultation 10 November to 22 December 2023

This letter gives notification that we have published Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications (SMMCD1) to the Purbeck Local Plan. These latest Main Modifications have been prepared after we received interim findings and next steps from the Planning Inspectors on 24 May 2023.

At the request of the Inspectors, we have also re-published earlier Main Modifications as part of a single document which shows all the changes necessary to make the local plan sound and legally compliant. We are not inviting responses through this consultation on those Main Modifications which have already been consulted upon (the consultation documents will make this clear). Weight will not be given to representations that repeat matters raised and discussed at hearing sessions, in earlier responses or which relate to Main Modifications which have already been subject to consultation.

Alongside the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications the council has also published addenda to its Habitats Regulation Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, revised local plan policies maps and updates on the housing land supply & local housing need.

These documents can be found online at www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/plpmainmods.

Our preferred method for you to provide a response is through the council's online consultation database. This will significantly speed up the analysis of comments and our ability to react to these responses. If you're not able to submit your response online, we will accept responses that have been:

- made in writing using the council's response form; and

- include the respondent's name and address.

We are not able to accept anonymous responses.

The council response form can be found on-line, downloaded and completed electronically or printed off and filled out manually.

The responses should be sent to planningpolicy@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk or to the address at the top of this letter.

Paper copies of the Supplementary Proposed Main Modifications, updated policy maps and Habitats Regulations Assessment Addendum and Sustainability Appraisal Addendum are available in libraries in Swanage, Wareham, Lytchett Matravers, Wool, Corfe Castle, Upton, Dorchester and Poole, Town Council offices at Wareham, Swanage and Upton and County Hall reception, Dorchester.

Comments should reach the council by 11.45pm on 22 December 2023

If you have any queries please don't hesitate to get in touch by telephone on 01305 838334, or email planningpolicy@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk using 'Purbeck Local Plan' in the subject bar

Yours faithfully

Hilary Jordan

Service Manager for Spatial Planning

**Appendix 3 – Revised National Planning Policy Framework
February 2019**

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

177. In this Appendix the council has considered the implications of the revised NPPF, in broad reference to chapter headings and those key changes. All references to paragraph numbers in this Appendix relate to the NPPF published in February 2019.

Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

178. Changes to Footnote 37 in Paragraph 73. – The council has noted the clarification around the use of standard methodology to assess local housing need when calculating five-year supply. The council has made use of the standard methodology to assess local housing need (an updated assessment was presented as part of the latest consultation SMMCD5) and applied this figure when preparing its latest five-year housing land supply report (SMMCD4). Taking account of both matters, the council considers that the strategies and policies in its local plan do not conflict with this change.

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

179. Change to Paragraph 177. - The council has noted the clarification around the triggers for application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development in respect to habitat sites but does not consider that they materially affect the emerging policies or strategies in the Purbeck Local given their focus on decision taking. The council considers that the strategies and policies in its local plan do not conflict with this change.

Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

180. Change to Paragraph 209. a) – The council notes the omission of Paragraph 209. a) in respect to onshore oil and gas development but does not consider that the changes materially affect the emerging policies or strategies in the Purbeck Local given their focus on the sustainable use of minerals. The council considers that the strategies and policies in its local plan do not conflict with this change.

Glossary

181. Glossary definition of deliverable – The council notes the changes and clarification around the definition of the term ‘deliverable’. The council has taken account and applied the updated definition when preparing updates to the five-year housing land supply report (SMMCD4) for Purbeck. The council considers that the strategies and policies in its local plan do not conflict with this change.

182. Glossary definition of local housing need - The council notes the changes and clarification around the definition of the term ‘deliverable’. The council has taken account and applied the updated definition when preparing updates to its assessment of local housing need (SMMCD5) for Purbeck. The council considers that the strategies and policies in its local plan do not conflict with this change.

Appendix 4 – Revised National Planning Policy Framework July 2021

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

183. In this Appendix the council has considered the implications of the revised NPPF, in broad reference to chapter headings and those key changes. All references to paragraph numbers in this Appendix relate to the NPPF published in July 2021.

Achieving sustainable development

184. Changes to paragraph 11. a) – These changes add further requirements in respect of plan making when applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The council is satisfied that the strategies and policies in the Purbeck Local Plan are consistent with the additional requirements outlined in this paragraph. More specifically:

- a) The council considers that proposed policy allocations relating to towns (Upton) and key service villages (Lytchett Matravers, Redbridge Pit/Moreton Station and Wool) align growth with existing infrastructure, services and facilities (for further discussion on this matter see pages 9 to 12 of ‘SD95: Housing Need in Purbeck - Assessing and seeking to Meet the Identified Need’).
- b) The council considers that the environmental policies (Policies E1 to E12) and those allocations for new homes (Policies H4 to H7) made through the Purbeck Local Plan will improve the environment.
- c) The council is satisfied that the local plan will mitigate climate change and adapt to its effects. (See the council’s response to Matter A, Issues 6, Question 4 of the Planning Inspector’s Matters Issues and Questions).

Plan Making

185. Changes to Paragraph 22. - The council does not consider that the proposed policy allocations amount to significant extensions to existing towns and villages which necessitate changes to the vision set out in the Purbeck Local Plan. Irrespective of the council’s position around the interpretation of this paragraph, Paragraph 221 of the NPPF also clarifies that: ‘...the policy on larger-scale development in paragraph 22, this applies only to plans that have not reached Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (pre-submission) stage at the point this version is published (for Spatial Development Strategies this would refer to consultation under section 335(2) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999).’ Taking account of both matters, the council considers that its local plan remains consistent with this change.

186. Changes to paragraph 35. d) – The council is satisfied that the Purbeck Local Plan is consistent with the policies in the NPPF and other statements of national planning policy.

Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

187. Changes to Paragraph 65. – The council is satisfied that the requirements of Policy H11: Affordable housing, with respect to the total number of homes available for affordable home ownership, are consistent with the requirements in paragraph 65.

188. Changes to Paragraph 73. – Purbeck is a predominantly rural area and as such the choice of transport modes is more limited than that offered in predominantly urban areas. The proposed housing allocations at Moreton Station/Redbridge Pit (Policy: H4) and Wool (Policy: H5) are well located relative to railway stations and policy allocations require

developments at Moreton Station/Redbridge Pit, Wool and Lytchett Matravers (Policy: H6) to improve accessibility by forming or improving defined walking and cycle routes. Policy I2: Improving accessibility and transport seeks to promote transport choice ‘...through improvements to public transport services, the protection and improvement of public rights of way and promotion of walking and cycling networks to provide a genuine alternative to the car and facilitate changes in travel habits...’. The council is satisfied that the proposed allocations include a genuine choice of transport modes.

189. Changes to Paragraph 73. c) - The council has adopted a District Design Guide as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Purbeck Area. The SPD ‘...provides an overview of the design principles that should be applied in devising many common development proposals.’ The supporting text relating to ‘Policy E12: Design’ in the council’s local plan refers to the SPD and other relevant guidance relating to design.

Promoting healthy and safe communities

190. Changes to Paragraph 92. b) – Policy E12: Design, and specifically criterion c., is entirely consistent with the requirement in paragraph 92. b) of the NPPF about delivering safe and accessible places which maintain quality of life and community cohesion.
191. Changes to Paragraph 96. – The council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the requirements in proposed housing allocations (Policies H4 to H7) and infrastructure policies (Policies: I1, I3, I4, I6 and I7) demonstrate that the council has positively engaged with promoters and other key organisations to plan for required facilities and resolve key planning issues before planning applications are submitted.

Promoting sustainable transport

192. Changes to Paragraph 106. d) – The proposed housing allocations and Policy I2 support delivery of attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks and are therefore entirely consistent with this paragraph of the NPPF.
193. Changes to Paragraph 110. c) –The council’s policies support well designed places which are easy to move around. More specifically the local plan policies seek to improve connectivity between places by enhancing physical access and opportunities to make use of different modes of travel (as part of this the council’s policies seek to promote walking and cycling). There are no conflicts between the proposed policy allocations (Policies H4 to H7), Policy E12 (design) and Policy I2 (improving accessibility and transport) of the Purbeck Local Plan and these revisions to the NPPF. The design of streets, parking areas and other transport elements of development in Purbeck should reflect current national guidance including the National Design Guide and the National Design Code.
194. Insertion of Footnote 46 – The council’s local plan does not refer to Design Bulletin 32. There are no conflicts between this change to national policy and the council’s local plan.

Making Effective use of land

195. Changes to Paragraph 125. – The council has prepared and adopted conservation appraisals, and a series of townscape character appraisals as supplementary planning documents (the townscape character appraisals relate to several settlements including both towns and key service villages). The council’s design guide (also adopted as a supplementary planning document) supports efficient use of land. The council is satisfied that this available guidance in conjunction with local plan policies (the council sought to

achieve optimal densities on the proposed housing allocations which reflected their specific characteristics and location) and the NPPF will support efficient use of land in Purbeck whilst also creating beautiful and sustainable places.

Achieving well-designed places

196. Changes to Paragraph 128. – The council has prepared a design guide for the Purbeck area. The council's local plan does not preclude consideration of the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code in conjunction with its design guide when taking decisions on planning applications. The council is satisfied that its local plan is consistent with this revision to national planning policy.
197. Changes to Paragraph 129. – See the council's response to paragraph 128: it is satisfied that its local plan is consistent with this revision to national planning policy.
198. Changes to Paragraph 131. – The council's local plan policies support retention of existing trees (in respect of proposed allocations, see Policy H3 criterion i. and Policy H4 criterion g.) and stipulate that the design of development should take account of existing trees and hedgerows (Policy E1). Policy I3 (green infrastructure, trees and hedgerows) was subject to a proposed Main Modification (MM73) which introduced a further requirement for new development to replace or plant additional locally native trees and hedgerows where appropriate. The council does not consider that its planning policies conflict with this change to the NPPF. Applicants and the council will take account of the requirement to 'ensure that new streets are tree lined' and agree measures for long term maintenance of trees when taking decisions on planning applications. The council does not consider that this requirement needs to be duplicated in its local plan in order to give it effect.
199. Changes to Paragraph 134. a) & b) – The council's design policy (Policy E12) requires local character and design to be taken into account when considering the design of new development. The supporting text to Policy E12 encourages applicants to have regard to local design guidance in new development. The policies in the council's local plan are consistent with these changes to national policy.
200. Changes to Paragraph 135. – These changes do not introduce any requirements in respect to plan making. The council is satisfied that the policies in its local plan do not conflict, and are therefore consistent, with this change to national planning policy.
201. Changes to Paragraph 161. – The council published a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2018) as part of preparing the Purbeck Local Plan. The Level 1 SFRA takes account of the flood risks from multiple sources (including rivers/sea, surface water, sewer flooding and ground water flooding). The council took account of these risks when undertaking the sequential test of the local plan. The council is satisfied that its approach to preparing the Purbeck Local Plan is consistent with this change to national planning policy.
202. Changes to Paragraph 162. – See the council's response to the changes in Paragraph 161 of the NPPF. It is satisfied that its approach to preparing the Purbeck Local Plan is consistent with this change to national planning policy.
203. Changes to Paragraph 163. – The council has applied the sequential test when assessing the suitability of sites and preparing its strategies to meet Purbeck's needs. It has taken account of the risks from all sources of flooding, as identified in its SFRA, and has not limited consideration of alternative sites on the basis of the risks identified by the flood risk

zones (relating to main rivers and the sea). The council is satisfied that its approach to preparing the Purbeck Local Plan is consistent with this change to national planning policy.

204. Changes to Paragraph 167. b) – This paragraph of the NPPF specifically relates to decision making on planning applications. The council’s policy on flood risk (Policy E4) includes requirements (criterion f.) for flood resistance and resilience, and future proofing. The council considers that these requirements would allow for development to be quickly brought back into use (without significant refurbishment) in the event of a flood. The council is satisfied that its planning policy is consistent with this change to national policy.

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

205. Changes to Paragraph 176. – No areas within Purbeck are designated as National Park or Broads, and therefore the parts of the NPPF which specifically relate to these designations are not relevant to Purbeck or the Purbeck Local Plan. Parts of Purbeck are designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Policy E1 of the council’s local plan reflects the general requirement for development to be limited within the AONB. The council’s policy also requires the ‘indirect’ impacts of development to be taken into consideration. The council is satisfied that its planning policy remains consistent with this change to the NPPF. It does not consider that there is a need to duplicate the requirements in national policy with further reference to setting.

206. Changes to Paragraph 177. – Policy E1 of the council’s local plan explicitly refers to the guidance in national policy relating to major development in designated areas. The council is satisfied that its planning policy remains consistent with this change to the NPPF.

207. Changes to Paragraph 180. d) – Paragraph 180. of the NPPF relates to the determination of planning applications. Policies E7, E8, E9 and E10 in the council’s local plan do not conflict with the change to this part of national policy. The council is satisfied that its planning policies remains consistent with this change to the NPPF.

208. Changes to Paragraph 198. – There are no specific policy requirements in the Purbeck Local Plan relating to historic statues, plaques, memorials, or monuments. The council does not consider that the changes to national policy need to be duplicated in its local plan. It is satisfied that there are no conflicts between its local plan and this change to national policy.

209. Changes to Paragraph 210. c) – The council’s Minerals and Waste Plans identify Mineral Consultation Areas. The council has taken these areas into consideration when assessing the suitability of sites which have been identified in its development strategies. The council is satisfied that its approach to preparing the Purbeck Local is consistent with this change to the NPPF.

210. Changes to Paragraph 221. – See council’s response to the changes in Paragraph 22. The council is satisfied that its local plan remains consistent with this change to national policy.

211. Changes to Paragraph 222. – The council notes the clarification provided in respect of the interpretation of findings from the Housing Delivery Test. The council is satisfied that its local plan remains consistent with this change to national policy.

212. Changes to definition of terms in Glossary – The glossary in the council’s local plan does not define: Article 4 directions, design guides or Mineral Consultation Areas. The council’s plan does not need to duplicate national planning policy to give it effect. There are no

conflicts between these changes to the NPPF and the council's plan. The council's local plan does define green infrastructure. The council's definition of what constitutes green infrastructure is not closed. It therefore allows blue spaces and other natural features to be treated as green infrastructure as defined through the change to the revised definition in the NPPF. Similarly when considering the benefits provided by green infrastructure, the council's definition would allow the further considerations outlined in the definition provided in the NPPF to be taken into account. The council is satisfied that there are no conflicts between the definitions provided in its local plan and these changes to the NPPF.

213. Insertion of Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification – The council's local plan does not refer to the flood risk vulnerability classification. The council does not consider that its plan need duplicate this change to national policy. The council is satisfied that its strategies and policies remain consistent with this change to national policy.

Other matters

214. The government has also recently introduced changes to planning practice guidance in respect to First Homes. First homes are a new type of affordable housing aimed at enabling first time buyers to purchase their first home. First homes will fall within the definition of affordable housing as set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF.
215. The First Homes policy will come into force from 28-Jun-2021. Transitional arrangements allow for local plans that have reached publication or examination stage by 28-Jun-2021, to be exempt from First Homes requirements. Therefore the Purbeck Local Plan is not required to reflect the First Homes requirements upon adoption though it is recognised that the inspector may require an early update to include First Home requirements.

Appendix 5 – Revised National Planning Policy Framework September 2023

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023

216. In this Appendix the council has considered the implications of the revised NPPF, in broad reference to chapter headings and those key changes identified. All references to paragraph numbers in this Appendix relate to the NPPF published in September 2023.

Meeting the challenge of climate change, flood and coastal change

217. Changes to Paragraph 155. a) – The council notes the changes to this paragraph (which relates to the aim of increasing the use and supply of renewable energy). The change involves a minor revision around the scope of energy strategy (to include consideration of future re-powering and life extension) and clarification around the requirement for addressing adverse effects. The council is satisfied that its planning Policy E3 of the Purbeck Local Plan and the supporting text remain consistent with this change to the NPPF.

218. Changes to paragraph 158. c) and Footnotes 53a and 54 - The council notes the changes to this paragraph (which relates to the assessment renewable and low carbon development). Paragraph 158. c) introduces a specific assessment criteria around repowering and life extensions to existing renewable sites. Whilst Policy E3 does not expressly reference repowering and life extensions to existing renewable sites, it does not include any requirements or limitations which conflict with the revisions to national planning policy. The council also notes the clarification and revisions in footnotes 53a and 54 around Development Orders, Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders and the clarification around the assessment of planning applications involving wind turbines. The council is satisfied that its planning Policy E3 of the Purbeck Local Plan is compatible with these changes to the NPPF.

Other matters - Annex 1 Implementation

219. Changes to Paragraph 222. – Notwithstanding the council's review above in respect to Paragraph 155., the council notes that these requirements should only be applied to plans which have not reached Regulation 19 of the Town and Country (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2022 as of September 2023. The Purbeck Local Plan reached Regulation 19 of the plan making process in January 2019.