

GILLINGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN, 2016-2031

North Dorset District Council is satisfied that the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031 as modified meets the basic conditions, is compatible with the Convention rights and complies with the definition of a neighbourhood development plan.

A referendum will therefore be held on 12 July 2018.

Background

The Gillingham Neighbourhood Area was designated in August 2012 in accordance with Part 2 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (the 'Regulations'). The relevant body is confirmed as the Town Council and the designated neighbourhood area covers the same administrative area as the Town Council (Gillingham civil parish).

In July 2017 Gillingham Town Council submitted its draft neighbourhood plan and supporting material to North Dorset District Council. The District Council was satisfied that the documents submitted met the requirements of Regulation 15 of the 'Regulations'. The Town Council was notified of the District Council's conclusion and informed that the plan could proceed to examination.

The submitted documents were made available for consultation from 4 January to 15 February 2018, and an independent examiner, David Kaiserman, was appointed to examine the Plan. The examiner's report was received on 4 April 2018.

In summary, the examiner's report concluded that the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031 would meet the basic conditions and other legal requirements, subject to the modifications as set out in Appendix A of this decision statement. In addition, Appendix B sets out a table of factual errors and typos in the Plan that the District Council wish to correct with the agreement of the Town Council.

North Dorset District Council considered each of the recommendations and modifications contained in the examiner's report at its Cabinet meeting on 29 May 2018. In considering the conclusions of the independent examiner, the District Council agreed that the legal requirements and basic conditions had been met.

The council is therefore satisfied that the plan as amended...

- (i) meets the basic conditions (as set out in Schedule 4B to the Town & Country planning Act 1990); and
- (ii) is compatible with the Convention rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights act 1998); and
- (iii) complies with the provision concerning Neighbourhood Development Plans made by or under Sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and

...can now proceed to a referendum.

The area covered by the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031

The neighbourhood plan area covers the area of Gillingham (Dorset) civil parish only.

Details of the Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

The independent examiner considered that it was appropriate for the referendum to be held over the neighbourhood area.

The referendum will therefore be held over the neighbourhood area, being the same area as the area of Gillingham (Dorset) civil parish. In accordance with The Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012, as amended, the referendum for the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031 will be held on 12 July 2018 and information about it will be published on the District Council's website and made available for inspection no fewer than 28 days before the referendum.

Where to find more information...

Copies of this decision statement, the examiner's report and the neighbourhood plan can be viewed online via www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/Proposed-Gillingham-Plan and at the District Council Offices, South Walks House, Dorchester DT1 1UZ (8.30am to 5.00pm Monday to Thursday and 8.30am to 4.30pm on Friday).

APPENDIX A

Examiner's recommendations

Note: In the modifications column, underlining denotes additions and strike-through denotes deletions.

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
GNP1	Figure 5.1 to be modified to make clearer the relationship between the area of search around Harding's Lane and the settlement boundary. (37–38)	The Allard Family drew attention to the fact that the Strategy Map (figure 5.1) is unclear. The Examiner agreed.	Agree that currently the “area of search” symbols (green circles) are opaque and hide parts of the settlement boundary.	In Figure 5.1 make the “area of search” symbol partly transparent so that the settlement boundary can be seen.
GNP2	Reword Policy 1 to read: “On larger sites of 20 or more homes, developers should wherever practicable aim to allow for around 5% of plots to be made available for custom and self-build housing. Factors to be taken into account will include prevailing market conditions, demand, viability and the type of housing to be provided, together with any specific site management considerations”. (42–47, 56–57 and 83)	Persimmon and CG Fry Ltd raise issues regarding the original policy on the basis that it should be based on robust, local evidence, it could present practical issues on larger sites, and that there would be uncertainty over the take-up of plots. However, the Examiner saw that these matters were recognised by supporting material in para 6.11, and recommended that these elements should be moved into the policy text.	Agree that the proposed modifications add clarity to the intention and implementation of the policy.	Amend Policy 1: “On larger sites of <u>20 or more homes</u> , developers should make provision <u>wherever practicable aim to allow for around 5% of plots to be made available</u> for custom and self-build housing. <u>Factors to be taken into account will include prevailing market conditions, demand, viability and the type of housing to be provided, together with any specific site management considerations.</u> ”
GNP3	Resolve the difference between figures 9.4 and 9.5 relating to the proposed cycle route in the area of Park Farm. (58)	CG Fry and Son have applied for outline planning permission for the development of land at Park Farm. They point out an apparent discrepancy between figs 9.4 and 9.5 and the Examiner agrees that this should be resolved in the interest of clarity.	Agree that maps showing the same information should be consistent.	Amend proposed cycle route around Park Farm in Figure 9.5 to match Figure 9.4.
GNP4	Undertake a general review of map	The Examiner states that where maps	Agree that policy maps need	Map in Chapter 3 – add caption to

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
	bases with the aim of improving their clarity and definition, as well as the way information is displayed. This might suggest the use of larger bases in some cases, and/or a decision to display less information on any one map. (79–80)	are intended to show the areas within which policies are meant to apply it is essential that there is as much clarity as possible – otherwise, there will be unhelpful uncertainty for land-owners, potential developers and local decision-makers.	to be as clear as possible. (Note that new policy maps will be produced by NDDC in consultation with GTC, using the supplied GIS data.)	read “Figure 3.1 – The Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan Area” Figure 8.1 – update key with which policies apply where, and use black and white base map. Figure 9.1 – show only the “station hub” and include an appropriate key. Figures 9.4 and 9.5 – see GNP3. Figure 10.2 – show only the Hardings Lane site on the map and include an appropriate key. Figure 10.3 – add “Bank” to the key. Merge Figures 11.2 and 11.4 and split Figure 11.5 –so that the sites boundaries are clearer by drawing them on maps of an appropriate scale. Figure 13.2 – for clarity split into separate maps for each of the character areas.
GNP5	Move the requirement set out in paragraph 7.15* to the body of Policy.	The Examiner notes that para 7.15 is intended to be a development management tool governing the approach to be taken to applications	Agree that the proposed modifications add clarity to the intention and implementation of the policy.	Delete para 7.15 and add the following to the end of Policy 5: <u>“Where an employment site becomes vacant, the site should</u>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
	<p>* Paragraph 7.15: "Where an employment site becomes vacant, the site should be actively marketed at a reasonable price for at least twelve months without restriction, to enable alternative employment uses to come forward". (88)</p>	<p>which might involve the loss of an existing employment use. It should therefore be contained within the body of the Policy itself.</p>		<p><u>be actively marketed at a reasonable price for at least twelve months without restriction, to enable alternative employment uses to come forward."</u></p>
<p>GNP6</p>	<p>Not to use the word "alternative" in Policy 12 and supporting section unless there is a clear need for it in the interests of clarity, and rename Policy 12 to "Pedestrian and cycle links". (99)</p>	<p>NDDC drew attention to the fact that this section refers to pedestrian and cycle routes as "alternative" routes, which seemed unnecessary and confusing. The Examiner agreed. He also agreed that the policy title should delete the reference to "the road network", since its substance is restricted to pedestrian and cycle links.</p>	<p>Agree that the word "alternative" is unnecessary in most cases in this section.</p>	<p>Amend title of section (page 27 to "The road network, and alternative Pedestrian and cycle links"</p> <p>Amend Para 9.12, line 10 to: "...Neighbourhood Plan to consider practical safe and attractive alternatives <u>routes</u> for pedestrians..."</p> <p>Amend para 9.13, line 5 to: "...footpaths and cycle path connections that should provide this alternative network, and link..."</p> <p>Amend para 9.15 line 4 to: "...necessary improvements for delivering this key alternative pedestrian and cycle network."</p> <p>Amend title of Policy 12 to: "The road network, and alternative Pedestrian and cycle links"</p>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
GNP7	<p>Reword the last sentence of policy 13 to: "Large areas of hard shared surfacing and narrow winding roads with no clear visibility of pedestrian movements should be avoided unless these can be justified on urban design or placemaking grounds".</p> <p>(100)</p>	<p>CG Fry and Son suggested amending policy 13 to provide some flexibility in the way the issue of hard surfaces is handled. The Examiner agreed that this would be sensible.</p>	<p>Agree that the proposed modifications would add flexibility to the application of the policy, which could be useful in certain circumstances.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 12 line 1 to: "The provision of the alternative pedestrian and cycle network as shown in Figure 9.4 will..."</p> <p>Amend final sentence of Policy 13 to: "<u>Excessive Large areas of hard shared surfaces surfacing</u> and narrow winding roads with no clear visibility of pedestrian movements should be avoided <u>unless these can be justified on urban design or placemaking grounds</u>".</p>
GNP8	<p>Delete Policy 17 along with the references to the information requirements set out in paragraph 10.16. If it is thought desirable to maintain some reference to the issue in the Plan, it should be addressed as a "community aspiration", in a separate part of the document.</p> <p>(105–108)</p>	<p>The Examiner had concerns about this section for a number of reasons. In particular, whether the information requirements set out in paragraph 10.16 could be enforceable. If it was, the extent of the information, even if it were always possible to obtain, is such that it would be a considerable burden on an applicant, especially if they were a small business. Although sympathetic to the social objectives being pursued, the Examiner concluded that policy 17 in its present form lacks the necessary precision to enable it to be a meaningful development management tool.</p>	<p>Agree that Policy 17 presents implementation difficulties. Furthermore, Policy 27 of LPP1 already contains a number of measures relating to the retention of community facilities, and clearly differentiates between commercial and non-commercial facilities.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 17. (Subsequent policies and references to them to be re-numbered.)</p> <p>Amend para 10.16 to: "These facilities are considered to make a real contribution to the social fabric of the local area, and their general location is shown in Figure 10.3. <u>It is a community aspiration that the loss of such community facilities should be retained where possible. Policy 27 of the Local Plan Part 1 sets out planning measures relating to the retention of community facilities. will normally be resisted, and in assessing the potential impact on the local community any</u></p>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
				<p>application for a 'change of use' should provide clear evidence on the following factors, so that the impact of such a loss can be more readily assessed:</p> <p>a) The general level of use, ideally showing records over the period of at least 5 years when the venue was operational.</p> <p>b) The general catchment population that facility has served.</p> <p>c) The alternative facilities providing that function in the area, and the extent to which these have spare capacity."</p>
GNP9	Delete the reference to St Martins House in paragraph 10.7 and figure 10.3. (109–110)	Magna Housing Ltd, who have an interest in St Martins House, drew the Examiner's attention to the fact that the building ceased to act as a community facility (adult education centre) in 2011. The Examiner agreed that the buildings are vacant.	Agree that at present St Martins House is not functioning as a community facility.	<p>Para 10.7, delete third sentence: "In the past, St Martin's House in Queen Street was run as an Adult Education Centre."</p> <p>Figure 10.3: delete St Martins House site.</p>
GNP10	Take steps to simplify and clarify Section 11 of the Plan. (111–112)	<p>The Examiner makes a number of general observations about Section 11 which leave him to conclude that the section needs revising. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of terms being used to describe green space. This is potentially confusing and so greater consistency of terminology is recommended. • The interrelationship between 	Agree that the section as currently laid out is potentially confusing and that this can be improved through a series of minor modifications.	<p>Amend para 11.5: "The rivers corridors that run through the parish provide an important network of <u>green</u> open-spaces (although at times these are subject to flooding)."</p> <p>Amend section heading below para 11.5: "Recreational <u>Green space</u> standards in new development"</p>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
		<p>references in the supporting text, the policies, the tables and the maps (and their keys) is often unclear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duplication of material (both in the policies and the supporting text), due largely to the inclusion of some over-arching or generic references. 		<p>Table 11.1, add title "Green space standards for Gillingham"</p> <p>Table 11.1, first row, amend: "Formal <u>outdoor</u> sports provision (playing pitches, etc.)"</p> <p>Para 11.8 and 11.9 and Green Space Map, add reference numbers to each of the sites, e.g. "OS04"</p> <p>Para 11.12 and Green Space Map, add reference numbers to each of the sites. (see GNP11)</p> <p>Policy 18, second sentence amend to: "Existing sites that provide formal outdoor sport provision (<u>as listed in paragraph 11.8 and shown on Figure 11.2</u>) will be protected as an important community resource. (<u>Policy 22 describes when replacement provision may be acceptable.</u>)"</p> <p>Para 11.14, second sentence: "The following <u>Table 11.3</u> lists the main spaces under these categories."</p> <p>Para 11.15, include reference</p>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
				<p>number to Fernbrook Lane area: "IR04".</p> <p>Para 11.16 include reference number to Old Chantry Fields: "IR29"</p> <p>Policy 19 – see GNP12 and GNP13</p> <p>Para 11.17, add reference numbers to each of the sites.</p> <p>Policy 20, second sentence: "Existing allotments (<u>as listed in paragraph 11.17 and shown on Figure 11.2</u>) will be protected as an important community resource. (<u>Policy 22 describes when replacement provision may be acceptable.</u>)"</p> <p>Policy 20, final sentence: "Further land for allotments should be located within land at Common Mead (<u>AL02</u>), or in the areas of search, <u>as shown in Figure 11.2.</u>"</p> <p>Para 11.20, consider using reference numbers "NS04" etc. to identify list of sites.</p> <p>Policy 21, see GNP14.</p>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
				<p>Paragraph 11.23, add reference numbers to sites. (CE01 and CE02)</p> <p>Policy 22: Add reference number to site ("as CE03 in Figure 11.2").</p> <p>Section title below Policy 22, amend to: "<u>Protecting Areas of important local green spaces</u>"</p> <p>Para 11.24 amend to: "All the <u>various green spaces</u> described above and shown in <u>Figure 11.2</u> the various maps – the areas for formal sports <u>fields</u> (playing pitches etc.), equipped play areas, informal recreation and amenity space, allotments, cemeteries and accessible natural green space – are <u>important components of Gillingham's essential green infrastructure for the area.</u>"</p> <p>Table 11.6 – add reference numbers to the sites.</p> <p>Para 11.26 amend reference to Figure 11.5 to Figure 11.7.</p> <p>Para 11.26 – bullet list of sites appears to duplicate table below</p>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
				<p>so delete.</p> <p>Para 11.26 and Policy 23 – refer to “development south-west of Bay” – identify this on new Figure 11.7.</p> <p>Table 11.7 – add reference numbers to sites, e.g. 1,2,3</p> <p>Para 11.27, add to the end of the paragraph: “It has therefore been identified as a visually sensitive area (as shown on Figure 11.7).”</p> <p>Policy 23, second paragraph, amend to: “The areas of search (as shown in Figure 11.4) identified for new <u>outdoor sports</u> provision of formal sports and <u>areas identified for additional informal recreation, allotments and cemetery provision (as shown in Figure 11.2)</u> /amenity space and ancillary development should be safeguarded from alternative development that would prejudice their delivery, unless there is a clear over-riding public benefit to the proposed development that cannot reasonably be located outside of that area.”</p>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
				<p>Policy 23, third paragraph: "Local Green Spaces, as <u>listed in Table 11.4 and mapped in Figure 11.5</u>, are to be protected from development that would detract from their reason for designation."</p> <p>Policy 23, fourth paragraph: "Development that would reduce the openness of the <u>Important Open Gaps listed in Table 11.6 and shown mapped in Figure 11.7</u> will not be permitted. Development in the area south west of Bay (<u>as shown in Figure 11.7</u>) should include a suitable landscaping scheme to retain the distinct character of Bay as a separate (historic) settlement."</p>
GNP11	Cross-reference paragraph 11.12 and figure 11.2 by appropriate numbering. (112–113)	Para 11.12 describes a number of 'areas of search' and these are shown on Figure 11.2, however it is not clear which site is which.	Agree that numbering of sites would improve and consequently help with the implementation of Policy 18.	Add reference numbers to sites in para 11.12 and Figure 11.2.
GNP12	Redraft the first sentence of policy 19 in order that the appropriate standards are more clearly described. (114)	Policy 19 reiterates standards of provision previously set out in Table 11.1. However, the Examiner found that they are somewhat difficult to understand with three different aspects of demand being described in one sentence.	Agree that re-wording would improve clarify.	Amend Policy 19, first sentence as follows: " Informal play and recreation areas <u>consisting of parks, gardens and amenity green space</u> should be provided to meet local needs at the recommended standard of 1.4ha per 1,000 people <u>within 700 metres of people's homes.</u> of parks, gardens and amenity green

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
				<p>space, and <u>Small</u> equipped play areas <u>for very young children should be</u> within 100m <u>of most homes.</u> (for very young children) <u>Locally Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) should be</u> within 400m (for children who can go out to play independently) of most homes.”</p>
GNP13	<p>Give Table 11.3 an explanatory title and the overall relationship between figure 11.4, table 11.3 and paragraph 11.20 should be made much clearer. This includes the need to differentiate between existing provision and proposed additions or enhancements. (115)</p>	<p>Table 11.3 currently has no title but appears to be a list of existing open space sites that Policy 19 seeks to protect. Figure 11.4 appears to show these sites on a map, but it is not clear which site is which, and the map does not clearly distinguish between existing and proposed sites. Paragraph 11.20 lists seven main areas where additional public access to green space may be sought and these are also shown on Figure 11.4, but again it is not clear which site is which.</p>	<p>Agree that in order for Policy 19 to operate successfully, it needs to be clear which sites it applies to.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19, third paragraph to read: “Existing sites for equipped play areas and informal recreation / amenity spaces (<u>as listed in Table 11.3 and shown in Figure 11.2</u>) will be protected as an important community resource. (<u>Policy 22 describes when replacement provision may be acceptable.</u>)”</p> <p>Policy 19, fourth paragraph, add reference numbers to each of the sites shown on Figure 11.2 (similar to changes made to paras 11.15 and 11.16 made by GNP10).</p> <p>Add title to Table 11.3 to read “Existing equipped plays areas and informal recreation / amenity spaces”.</p> <p>In Table 11.3 and Figure 11.2 add</p>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
GNP14	Remove uncertainties (as to which sites Policy 21 relates to) either by changes to the wording of policy 21 or to figure 11.4, or both. (118)	Para 11.20 has a list of sites that appear to be protected by Policy 21. These sites are numbered and shown on Figure 11.4. However, Figure 11.4 includes additional sites not listed in para 11.20 (e.g. land at Colesbrook). The Examiner states that it is important for users of the Plan to understand clearly the intended status of identified areas of land.	Agree that it needs to be made clearer which sites Policy 21 relates to.	unique reference numbers to each of the sites. Amend Policy 21, sentence two to: "Areas of natural green space as <u>listed in paragraph 11.20 and shown identified</u> in Figure 11.2 will be safeguarded as an important green infrastructure resource for local residents." (<u>Policy 22 describes when replacement provision may be acceptable.</u>)" Amend new Figure 11.2 to make the extent of areas of natural green space clear.
GNP15	Amend Policy 23 so that ecological value as well as recreational value is taken into account. (124)	The policy protects open space for its recreational or amenity value (including ecological benefits) but allows it to be replaced with new space of equal or better recreational value. Natural England point out that reference to ecological value should be included in the clause relating to replacement provision. The Examiner agreed that this is reasonable given the overall objectives of the policy.	Agree that at best the policy as currently worded is ambiguous.	Amend Policy 23 second sentence to: "Development on, or change of use of these open spaces that would reduce their recreational, or amenity <u>or ecological value</u> (including consideration of their wider environmental and ecological benefits) will not be permitted unless <u>replaced by alternative and/or suitable replacement provision</u> of equal or better recreational quality or value is <u>provided</u> <u>provision</u> in a location which is better placed and accessible to the surrounding community it serves, in line with the adopted standards referred to

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
GNP16	<p>The title of figure 13.1 should refer to its origins in the Enhancement Plan, and that the Conservation Enhancement Plan should be added to the list of "useful documents" set out in section 15 of the Plan. (130)</p>	<p>NDDC stated that Figure 13.1 had no introduction and it was not clear where it came from. NDDC also stated that since Policy 27 relies on the Conservation Enhancement Plan, it should be listed in Section 15 'Useful Documents'. The Examiner agreed that these were sensible suggestions.</p>	<p>Agree that simple modifications would improve the clarity and implementation of Policy 27.</p>	<p>in the North Dorset Local Plan."</p> <p>Amend title of Figure 13.1 to: "Gillingham Town Conservation Area, from the Conservation Enhancement Plan."</p> <p>Amend Policy 27 to: "Proposals within the Gillingham Town <u>Centre</u> Conservation Area <u>(as shown in Figure 13.1)</u> should support the heritage enhancement of this area and have due regard to the Conservation Enhancement Plan."</p> <p>Section 15, add Gillingham Conservation Enhancement Plan to list of useful documents.</p>
GNP17	<p>Remove listed buildings from the information shown on pages 73–75.</p> <p>Make Figure 13.2 clearer to distinguish designated and non-designated heritage assets, and should cross-refer to Policy 28. (133)</p>	<p>Paragraph 13.18 states: "Locally important non-designated heritage assets have been identified below." However, the list over pages 73–75 also includes listed buildings (designated assets). The Examiner concludes that it would make the Plan easier to interpret were the listed buildings to be removed from this section.</p> <p>Similarly, Figure 13.2 shows both listed and locally important buildings, albeit in different colours. However, given the scale of the map, it is difficult to distinguish individual</p>	<p>Agree that this section could be made clearer, particularly if Policy 28 is re-worded to only protect locally important buildings (see GNP18).</p>	<p>Delete listed buildings from pages 73–75.</p> <p>Replace the parish-wide map in Figure 13.2 with separate maps for each character area. (Some buildings were previously listed in the wrong character area – this has been corrected.)</p> <p>Add reference numbers to each site/building so that the text and the maps are clearly cross-referenced.</p>

NDDC reference	Examiner's recommendations (paragraphs from Examiner's report)	Explanation / background	NDDC's consideration of recommendation	Decision / Modifications required
GNP18	Reword Policy 28 to: "Support will be given wherever practicable to the protection and enhancement of the locally-listed buildings and other local heritage assets shown in figure 13.2 and set out in table...." (131–132, 134)	buildings. Magna Housing point out that Policy 28 as currently worded does not distinguish between non-designated and designated assets. They suggest that reference to conservation areas and scheduled monuments should be removed from the policy since they are already protected by legislation and national planning policy. The Examiner agreed that this is appropriate given the title of the policy and that designated heritage assets are already protected through legislation and national planning policy.	Agree that designated heritage assets are already sufficiently protected.	Amend Policy 28, first sentence to: " <u>Support will be given wherever practicable to the protection and enhancement of the locally listed buildings and other local locally important buildings, Conservation Areas, scheduled monuments and the locally important parkland at Wyke Hall are heritage assets shown in figures 13.2 to 13.12 and set out in the associated tables below of the plan area and must be protected for future generations, in line with national and adopted Local Plan policies.</u> "

Modifications in order to correct errors in the submission plan

NDDC reference	Explanation / Background	Proposed modification to the NP
GNP19	The diagram under para 4.5 outlines the timescale for plan production. It requires a few changes to bring it up to date.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the arrow and the word “NOW”. • Underneath the “June 2017” line, insert another line that reads “Submission draft – 6 week public consultation” and “Jan–Feb 2018” • On the line that reads “District Council organises an independent examination of the Plan” update to “Feb–April 2018” • On the next line down, update to “12 July 2018” • On the next (and final) line, update to “27 July 2018”
GNP20	The terms ‘neighbourhood centres’ and ‘local centres’ appear to be used interchangeably. As they are different planning terms this could cause confusion. The term ‘local centre’ is used in Policy 21 of LPP1 to describe the new centre being proposed on the southern extension. Therefore in order to maintain consistency and avoid any confusion, it is recommended the term ‘local centre’ is used throughout.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Figure 5.1, first item of the Key, amend to: “Town and neighbourhood <u>local</u> centres” • In Policy 9, first sentence, amend to: “Development proposals for shops, financial and professional services, food and drink, or leisure and community uses may be located within or adjoining the local centres in Milton-on-Stour, Lodbourne, Broad Robin and the new southern neighbourhood <u>local centre in the southern extension</u> (as broadly shown in Figure 9.5) if they are appropriate in type and scale for the local neighbourhood, and do not undermine the vitality of the town centre.” • Figure 9.5 – amend the label “New Southern Neighbourhood Centre” to “New Southern Extension Local Centre”.
GNP21	Policies currently consist of a mix of ordered lists (a,b,c,etc.) and unordered lists (bullet points). For consistency and to help with referencing, use ordered lists across all policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 5 – change bullet list to a,b,c,d, and e. • Policy 15 – change bullet list to a,b,c, and d. • Policy 16 – change bullet list to a,b, and c.
GNP22	Covered by GNP4.	•
GNP23	Para 7.16 makes reference to saved Policy GRF1 of the Local Plan 2003, however this isn’t clear as currently drafted. It should be noted that the policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend para 7.16, first sentence to “Under the <u>2003</u> previous Local Plan there has been <u>is</u> a policy (<u>GRF1</u>)”

NDDC reference	Explanation / Background	Proposed modification to the NP
	continues to be in force until deleted by a subsequent Local Plan. A small modification to the text would make the reference clearer.	aimed at landowners and farmers in..."
GNP24	Figure 9.4 – Above the map is the title “NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICY SUGGESTIONS” in block capitals and underlined – this is not consistent with the rest of the document and is considered confusing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 9.4 – delete title.
GNP25	Covered by GNP4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
GNP26	Policy 26 is missing the word “and” in the third sentence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Policy 26, third sentence to: “Existing trees <u>and</u> other landscape features that support local wildlife or are of local historic interest should be an integral part of any new development.
GNP27	The Colesbrook Conservation Area was designated September 2017, after the Plan was submitted. Text and maps in the Plan should be updated to reflect this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend para 13.6: “There are currently three <u>four</u> designated Conservation Areas in the parish, one covering <u>Gillingham Town Centre</u> (the area around Lower High Street and The Square), <u>Colesbrook</u>, the more recently designated area, <u>Milton-on-Stour</u>, and Wyke, and one encompassing most of Milton-on-Stour. There is a Conservation Area Appraisal for Wyke, produced in 2011.” • Amend beginning of para 13.7: “Further areas are <u>A further area is being considered</u> for Conservation Area designation at Colesbrook and Bay- <u>and G</u> consideration is being given to extending Gillingham Town Conservation area.” • Amend Figure 13.2 to show Colesbrook as a conservation area (in line with other changes made by GNP17).
GNP28	Historic England maintains the ‘at risk’ register - www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend 13.9, second sentence: replace “English Heritage” with “Historic England”.
GNP29	Policy 28 protects locally important heritage assets. Para 13.18 states “A more detailed description of the buildings is provided in a separate report.” The information in this separate report appears to be important to the implementation of Policy 28, and therefore the report needs to be referenced and obtainable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend second sentence of para 13.18 to: “A more detailed description of the buildings is provided in a separate report, <u>non-designated heritage assets supplementary document for Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan – June 2017 held at Gillingham</u>

NDDC reference	Explanation / Background	Proposed modification to the NP
GNP30	Para 11.10 refers to moving the Football Club to a new facility at Hardings Lane in August 2017. Update with latest position.	<p><u>Town Council.</u>"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First sentence of para 11.10, amend to: "Gillingham Town Football Club hopes to move to a new <u>new opens an additional</u> facility at Hardings Lane in August 2017 <u>July 2018</u> (OS05).
GNP31	Para 11.13 – refers to CIL, however NDDC has no immediate plans to adopt this, preferring Section 106 instead.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend 11.13 to "Limited funding towards such provision may be made available from <u>Section 106</u> or the Community Infrastructure Levy..."
GNP32	Update page headers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend to: "Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Version: July 2018"
GNP33	Update from Gillingham Town Council regarding green space management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend beginning of para 11.19 to: "Some <u>Most</u> areas are managed for public access by the Dorset Countryside Rangers <u>Gillingham Town Council</u>..."
GNP34	Update from Gillingham Town Council regarding ownership of Withy Wood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend beginning of para 11.20 to "Land at Withy Wood (<u>partly</u> owned by <u>Gillingham Town Council and Network Rail</u>)..."
GNP35	Update from Gillingham Town Council regarding locally listed buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete reference to Laurel Cottage and 1 Church Walk (already Grade II listed) • Delete reference to 1 & 2 Oldlands • Delete reference to 1–5 Kings Court Road • Add reference to "Bus Shelter" on High Street.