

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
Executive Summary	Suggest that the frequency and disposition of local green spaces identified as a special characteristic that makes Fontmell Magna locally distinctive could be emphasised in the Executive Summary	CCWWD AONB	Include reference to LGS and Collyer's Brook and Fontmell Brook as distinctive features.
Policy wording (general point)	An overarching point to make is the need for all policies to be worded in a way which remains sufficiently flexible to remain reasonable and implementable. For example, the use of 'must' is unlikely to be appropriate in the majority of cases, especially where policies do not identify the other relevant considerations.	NDCC	Policies reviewed to determine where to use "should" and where to use "must" ("Should" means we expect this condition to hold but there may be exceptional circumstances where the applicant must provide evidence on why the condition cannot be met).
Map 1 / 2 / 5	It would be helpful to show the AONB boundary on all maps	CCWWD AONB	AONB boundaries added to maps.
Section 1 Paragraph 1.2	The population data showing the lack of adults in their 20's and 30's seems to be quite a key element in setting out a case for affordable housing and maintaining the viability and vitality of the village facilities that could be given greater emphasis.	CCWWD AONB	Wording added to 1.2 that the gap may be attributable to the lack of affordable housing.
Section 1 Paragraph 1.3	There are some sites east of the A350 where the AONB designation does not apply	London and Wessex Limited	The para provides a broad overview and says "Much" (not all) of the area is protected. No change required
Section 1 Paragraph 1.4	The Conservation Area boundary should be reviewed	London and Wessex Limited	Changes to the Conservation Area boundary are outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. The draft Conservation Area is subject to separate consultation. No change required
Section 1 Paragraph 1.10	The Vision is distinctively positive, but would suggest changing 'preserve' in the second sentence to 'conserve'.	CCWWD AONB	Agreed, wording changed.
Section 1 Table 1	The table of Objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan is particularly helpful. I note, however, that there is no mention of avoiding the adverse impacts of overhead cables, poles, or communication masts.	CCWWD AONB	Already broadly covered by objectives 2a and 2b. No change required

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
Section 1 Table 1	Objectives 1(c), 2(b) & 2(d) are not delivered due to the proposed allocations west of the A350. Alternative sites, such as Site 12, should have been considered.	London and Wessex Limited	Site 12 was considered as part of the plan's preparation and scored policy against a number of criteria related to the plans objectives, as shown in Appx 2. The objector has mis-quoted the objectives – ie 1(c) is not "seeking to ensure there is no impact upon West Street" and is introducing unevidenced conjecture about future delivery and travel patterns. No change required
Section 2 Table 2	The contribution of LGS to the character of the village, described in later sections as a chequer board of green spaces, should be given greater emphasis at this point in order to support the case for designation of local green spaces.	CCWWD AONB	Agreed, wording added to 2.3. New LGS – the triangle of land adjacent to access to Home Farm - added.
Section 2 Policy FM1. Local Green Spaces	After detailed assessment against LGS criteria not all of the currently proposed areas may be suitable for designation. It is not clear whether the respective landowners have been consulted on the designation.	NDDC	Criteria used to assess LGS should include heritage, landscape, recreational and wildlife factors as set out in NPPF. All LGS' reviewed and three sites withdrawn.
Section 2 Policy FM2. Local Wildlife and Protected Species	We support that the plan is looking to adopt buffers to all watercourse to allow space for water and biodiversity interests.	Environment Agency	Support noted – no further action.
Section 2 Policy FM2. Local Wildlife and Protected Species	This policy needs to reflect the appropriate thresholds for BMP – ie: applies to all development sites of 0.1ha or greater in size or where there are known protected species or important habitats/habitat features.	NDDC, London and Wessex Limited	This is broadly covered in the policy by the phrase "where potential adverse impacts may otherwise arise" with reference in 2.9 to when this may be triggered, having had regard to the county guidelines (which are not adopted policy). Footnote added in paragraph 2.9 to link to webpage on Dorset Biodiversity Protocol.
Section 2 Policy FM3. Important Views	Note that six photographs on page 5 relate to the Special Views. However seven are listed on map 5.	CCWWD AONB	Photos on p.5 numbered and linked to Map 5.

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
Section 2 Policy FM4. The setting of the AONB	It is recommended that this policy is reviewed to more closely reflect national policy and the approach adopted in Policy 4 in the Local Plan Part 1. A presumption against development is not in line with the NPPF whose only presumption is the presumption in favour of sustainable development (para 14) and the setting of the AONB is not cited as an exception to this, implying that a planning balance judgement should still be exercised.	NDDC, Gladman, London and Wessex Limited	Minor amendments suggested to more accurately reflect the LP policy that development will be managed in a way that conserves and enhances the natural beauty of the area. "Within the visually sensitive area skirting the eastern extent of the village (see map 5 below), which forms part of the setting for the AONB, there will be a strong presumption against development that fails to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB." Amend supporting text to reference AONB online guidance.
Section 2 Policy FM4. The setting of the AONB	It is not just the land next to the AONB designation which forms part of its setting – what is read as forming part of the setting must be considered in terms of its impact upon views, landscape character and importance. There is absolutely no planning justification to preclude any development to the east of the A350.	London and Wessex Limited	Early advice received from the AONB officer (email dated 14/12/16) stated that "The AONB boundary to the east of the village is a little unusual as generally the boundary follows fixed features. It was drawn on the OS 1 inch to a mile scale plan and is clear enough to show which side of the A350 it follows and then it clearly indents eastwards. Nevertheless, the parts of the village east of the A350 are closely related to the AONB and hence fairly obviously the setting of the AONB. I am also conscious that not only are there significant public rights of way that overlook the village but also there are extensive areas of Open Access Land that overlook the eastern side of the village. That eastern side is, therefore, very sensitive. It would also be prudent to check the extent of views of the central and western parts of the village from these vantage areas. Views to the AONB should be considered by the NP group as the AONB scenery is an important characteristic of the village and is a major contributor to the sense of place of the village."

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
			This policy does not apply to land east of the A350 within the defined settlement boundary. Paragraph 2.14 amended to incorporate advice from Richard Burdon of AONB and to say that other areas of the village contribute to the setting of the AONB but not as sensitive as the east side.
Section 2 Policy FM5. Local Landscape Features	It is recommended that this policy is reviewed to more closely reflect national policy and the approach adopted in Policy 4 in the Local Plan Part 1 The policy as worded is too restrictive – for example, changes to highway frontages which involve the removal of hedgerows can be designed to remain rural in their design and not provide an urban appearance to the street scene and thus not give rise to harm.	NDDC, London and Wessex Limited	Policy FM5 amended to “Development should protect, and should reinforce, the local landscape character...” and change to “West St from Village Hall to Bedchester” - to more accurately reflect the LP policy that seeks the protection and retention of landscape features that characterise the area.
Section 2 Policy FM6. Dark Skies	The policy could be made more precise (and less subjective) by saying lighting must achieve zone E1 of the environmental lighting zones [Institute of Lighting Professionals]. That then means street lights aren't banned, but have to meet the criteria. It sets current criteria that a lighting designer/engineer can work to.	CCWWD AONB	Agreed - Policy FM6 wording amended in line with the suggested approach.
Section 3 Policy FM7. The Conservation Area and Locally Important Features	Springhead is not EH designated, but is on the DGT's Local List, and is just partly within the area of the NP. You will know of the history of this site and its current Trust ownership and objectives. You will also know of its cultural history, particularly - but not only - music. It may be that there is no threat to this site, but the DGT does suggest that some reference to this site within any consideration of Local Heritage Assets would be	Dorset Gardens Trust	Agreed that this needs to be referenced. Add “Gardens at Springhead” to policy FM7.

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
	beneficial. I attach two pages from the DGT Gazetteer, the brief description and map.		
Section 3 Policy FM7. The Conservation Area and Locally Important Features	The policy should be modified to accord with paragraph 135 of the NPPF that suggest assets are afforded protection commensurate to their significance, with a balanced judgement being undertaken where regard is had to scale of any harm or loss to these assets.	Gladman	Policy FM7 amended to state "...and should be afforded protection having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset."
Section 3 Map 7	Site 24 partly overlaps with the pattern of open spaces identified on Map 7	London and Wessex Limited	Map 7 amended to resolve overlap.
Section 3 Policy FM8. Development layout Section 9 and Para 9.6	Replicating the chequer board pattern of green spaces and places (para 9.6), is clearly a positive argument for having proposed development at a low density	CCWWD AONB	Support noted – no further action
Section 3 Policy FM8. Development layout	The requirements of this policy to be overly restrictive, conflicting with Paragraph 58 of the NPPF which seeks to optimise the potential of a site to accommodate development, and the Local Plan policies in respect of design which advocate that development should take account of the character of the settlement and its context. Housing density of a scheme should be should be considered on its merits on a case by case basis.	Gladman, London and Wessex Limited	Para 58 also refers to the need to respond to local character and history. Policy 24 on Design is not a strategic policy, and the policy in the NP has taken into account local character and context. The density restriction only applies to new greenfield development for open-market housing. However the wording to be clearer - Policy FM8 wording amended, together with new para 3.6.
Section 3 Policy FM8. Development layout	The imposition of a parking standard in excess of the county guidelines runs contrary to the Local Plan.	Gladman, London and Wessex Limited	Policy 23 on Parking is not a strategic policy. County standards for development of up to 5 dwellings require at least 2 allocated parking spaces for 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings, and 1 or 2 spaces on smaller properties, plus a visitor parking space. Given the rural nature of the roads and only minor deviation from adopted standards, this policy is not considered overly restrictive

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
			No change required.
Section 3 Policy FM8. Development layout	12dph may not be achievable in viability terms given the need to provide affordable homes and other infrastructure, and the developable area of site 20 (1.4ha), equates to a gross density of 29dph for 40 dwellings.	Pennyfarthing Homes	Mention of 12dph density removed from Policy FM8. The homes planned for site 20 is also reduced to a maximum of 30, based on heritage concerns. Noted that the January 2018 developer consultation was based on revised lower density.
Section 3 Policy FM8. Development layout	Amend Policy FM8 in order to remove reference to cul-de-sacs if the term is intended to describe any single access development	Pennyfarthing Homes, London and Wessex Limited	The reference to cul-de-sac is relevant to the style of development and is not intended to prohibit any single-access development – and this is clear as it does not prohibit courtyard-style development. Policy FM10 deals with road connectivity. Minor amendment to clarify.
Section 3 Policy FM9. Building design	Support emphasis on the use of traditional design and materials	CCWWD AONB	Support noted.
Section 3 Policy FM9. Building design	Concerns re appropriateness of policy wording in respect of permitted development rights, and whether this implies an Article 4 Direction	NDDC, London and Wessex Limited	As worded this could be interpreted as suggesting an Article 4 direction is made to remove PD rights from all dwellings, when the intent was that this should be applied only to new dwellings. Policy FM9 wording amended to clarify.
Section 3 Policy FM9. Building design	It is not for the Neighbourhood Plan to predetermine all aspects of a development proposal and set a rigid design code for development within the village. It is wholly unreasonable to put in place a prescriptive code without any discernible evidence to back this up. This is completely contrary to North Dorset District Council's design policy; Policy 24, which states that proposals for development must justify how relevant aspects of the development address the design principle set out within the Local Plan and respond to their local context.	London and Wessex Limited	The policy is not rigid, does not include unnecessary prescription or detail, and has taken into account local character and context and the desire to positively reinforce this, including the work underpinning the Conservation Area appraisal. The NPPG makes clear that Neighbourhood Plans can set design codes and should set aspirations for areas considering what is already successful about them and how they could be improved. Policy 24 on Design is not a strategic policy. No change required.

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
Section 4 Policy FM10. Creating safer roads and pedestrian routes	Further consideration is needed on the policy approach to onward routes in order to ensure it is proportionate and implementable.	NDDC	Third paragraph of Policy FM10 amended to be clearer.
Section 4 Project P1. Delivering traffic management solutions	The comments on creating safer roads and pedestrian routes are particularly relevant for a village that evolved at a time when car ownership was significantly lower and goods vehicles were significantly smaller. However, the proposed traffic management solutions (Project P1) eg gateways and road marking may standardise, urbanise, and diminish the local distinctiveness of the village. Reference the adopted Dorset County Council Rural Roads Protocol	CCWWD AONB	Rural Roads Protocol included as new paragraph 4.8 (ref discussions are ongoing between Dorset CC and C13/A350 Community Group). Policy FM10 amended to include a paragraph: "the design of any road improvement scheme should be consistent with the Rural Roads Protocol set out in 4.8."
Section 5 Policy FM11. Sustainable drainage	We support the inclusion of the policy to reduce flood risk from new development. The requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment to be submitted for all development is more rigorous than the current NPPF and LP thresholds. The EA would only provide flood risk comments on applications within the flood map for planning, and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Dorset County) are only consulted on major development sites drainage.	Environment Agency / NDDC	EA Support noted. Reference to FRA for all sites has been discussed with DCC who agree that due to the prevalence of springs / flooding this would be appropriate and would comment in their role as LLFA Supporting text in paragraph 5.4 amended to include description of surface water flooding and run off issues, affecting West St and The Mead.
Section 5 Policy FM11. Sustainable drainage	We note there are no public surface water systems and we stress the need for all development proposals to provide sustainable drainage systems with outfalls to land drainage systems where necessary.	Wessex Water	Noted – no change required
Section 5 Policy FM11. Sustainable drainage	Whilst it may be a matter more related to building regulations the policy on sustainable drainage does not appear to require or encourage the reuse of	CCWWD AONB	Agreed - Paragraph 5.7, 1st sentence ".....and should be encouraged" added.

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
	grey water, or the capture of surface water, in new buildings.		
Section 5 Policy FM12. Development impacting on the sewage treatment works	We support the inclusion of the policy to ensure that the sewage treatment facility is able to accommodate flows prior to occupation. This because the facilities are Permitted by the Environment Agency, and Wessex Water will need to ensure that they are operating within the permitted allowances	Environment Agency	Support noted – no further action
Section 5 Policy FM12. Development impacting on the sewage treatment works	The points we raised in our previous response are well represented in the plan and in particular the constraints relating to the sewage treatment works and capacity. The threshold for improvements at the sewage works is formed around the population numbers rather than the number of connections. If applications come forward to trigger capacity improvements we will need time to plan design and construct a scheme before occupations occur. The plan makes allowance for this event.	Wessex Water	Support noted First sentence of paragraph 5.8 changed to “... likely to be triggered when the number of residents connected increases to 250.”
Section 6 Project P3. Use of Community Infrastructure Levy Funding	The Council is currently reviewing whether to implement CIL in light of potential changes to national policy. As such it may be appropriate to consider the inclusion of a policy which identifies relevant infrastructure which any major development will be expected to contribute towards through Section 106 agreements, where not identified within the relevant site allocations.	NDDC	Agreed - wording for Project P3 amended and converted into a new policy FM13A (policies to be renumbered) with additional supporting text to provide clearer explanation as to when contributions may be necessary.
Section 7 Policy FM14. Facilitating home working	The distinction between homeworking and commercial or business activities as set out in the Local Plan Part 1 should be clearer – it might only apply to applications in which the planning unit is the dwelling and its curtilage and any outbuilding	NDDC	Policy FM14 amended to more clearly reflect the limited circumstances to which it is intended to apply.

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
	will remain ancillary to and dependent upon the enjoyment of the dwelling.		
Section 7 Policy FM15. Supporting existing businesses	This policy is in conflict with a number of national and local policies and fundamental principles of planning and should be removed.	NDDC	The NPPF says NPs should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, and promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages. Policy FM15 amended accordingly.
Section 8 Policy FM16. Housing Types	The supporting text for housing needs is particularly helpful. The discussion about older people wishing to downsize but, nevertheless, needing sufficient space for storage or working from home is particularly relevant. The emphasis on not compromising space standards is appropriate.	CCWWD AONB	Support noted – no further action
Section 8 Policy FM16. Housing Types	Policy 7 of the LPP1 suggests that three or more bedroom properties should form the majority of open market housing types within any scheme. Justification for new open market housing to predominantly be of 1, 2 and some 3 bedroom properties will need to be proven by way of local circumstances and through viability.	Pennyfarthing homes	The Housing Needs Assessment provides this justification and Project 5. Local Housing Needs Assessment Review states that the Parish Council, working with local volunteers and the Local Planning Authority, will review and update the Housing Need Assessment over the Plan period. Viability is a recognised issue, and the policy wording provides some flexibility through using the verb 'should' Policy FM16 amended to use "should".
Section 9 FM17. Spatial Strategy for New Development	Whilst acceptance of the Local Green Spaces Policy would effectively limit infill, is policy FM17 sufficiently robust to resist proposals for infill development in and around those Green Spaces?	CCWWD AONB	Policy FM1: LGS precludes development on green spaces. Infill development around green spaces would be acceptable. No change required.
Section 9	If it is intended that site 20 should be developed before / in preference to sites 1, 24, or 22, this does not appear to be supported by policies	CCWWD AONB	It is hoped that Site 20 will be developed before Site 22, but consideration has been given to access arrangements if this is not the case. Sites

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
FM17. Spatial Strategy for New Development			24 & 1 as potential rural exception sites are to be deleted.
Section 9 FM17. Spatial Strategy for New Development	In the draft plan's current form the plan appears to provide allocations for up to 50 dwellings and retains scope for further provision within the settlement boundary and through the re-use of existing buildings. It may be appropriate to identify a maximum figure for the Plan-Period addressing the environmental constraints identified.	NDDC	Policy FM17 has been modified to say "This Plan makes provision for 30 to 35 new homes...". Modifications are also made to site allocations policies to reduce the total possible number. Although FM20 would allow up to 10, the actual amount delivered will depend on evidence of local need for the housing types specified. Similarly FM19 may be lower than the maximum number due to heritage or other considerations. As such although in theory the site allocations could deliver up to 40 it is more likely that they will deliver 30 – 35 dwellings, a minor deviation is not considered significant, provided that the detailed designs are acceptable in light of the environmental constraints.
Section 9 FM17. Spatial Strategy for New Development	The Local Plan review and changes in local housing needs may require Fontmell Magna to take additional growth - change to 'at least' 40 dwellings. Also consider allowing adjusting the policy to allow demonstrably sustainable development adjacent to the settlement boundary to be supported, as long as this was to accord with other policies in the development plan.	Gladman	An open-ended maximum would not be appropriate in what is an environmentally sensitive location. Allowing further unplanned development adjoining the settlement boundary would not be in conformity with the Local Plan or the core NPPF principle of recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
Section 9 FM17. Spatial Strategy for New Development	Based on the figures set within the SHLAA 2015 a proportional share of housing need for Fontmell Magna can be calculated based on its established number of households (319) compared with the total number of households within sustainable settlements in the District which are capable of accommodating growth (23302) divided by the housing need figure of 6,216 dwellings.	London and Wessex Limited	The HNA conclusions are based on a wide range of evidence including. As part of this it has taken into account the 2015 SHMA by applying a proportionate uplift to the Local Plan rural target, and was accepted by the Shillingstone NP examiner. The proposed approach by London and Wessex Limited is based on a pro-rata proportion of the strategic need, and would not

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
			conform with Strategic Policy 2 which states that "At Stalbridge and all the District's villages, the focus will be on meeting local (rather than strategic) needs" or Strategic Policy 6 (as it would result in a figure completed unrelated to the 825 dwellings proposed for the countryside including Stalbridge and the villages).
Section 9 FM17. Spatial Strategy for New Development	There is no evidence to substantiate that the traffic flow along the A350 create problems for persons to cross the road. Also see earlier comments questioning the robustness of the evidence for the visually sensitive area forming the setting of the AONB. There is no justification for a policy approach which seeks to restrict any development east of the A350; this should be removed.	London and Wessex Limited	Paragraph 4.4 to be strengthened with reference to 'Sight Lines at Crown Crossroads' analysis plus "Crossing the A350 relies on agility, hearing and vision, plus the absence of vehicles obscuring vision of traffic coming in both directions at the same time."
Section 9 Policy FM18. Settlement boundary	The AONB agrees that the revisions to the settlement boundary seem sensible	CCWWD AONB	Support noted – no further action
Section 9 Policy FM18. Settlement boundary	The site options assessment exercise has highlighted that the level of development if preferred sites are pursued has potential for dramatic transformation in the scale and character of the village that would result in significant harmful impacts on national and locally designated heritage assets. It is a matter of judgement whether that harm is deemed "substantial or "less than substantial", though it is important to be accurate in the definition of scale and type of impact that may result. It remains unclear that delivering the housing numbers proposed for the sites will fully comply with the contextually evidenced design criteria recommended. We must defer to North Dorset District Council and the	Historic England	Policy FM19 modified in discussion with the NDDC Conservation Team and Policy FM21 deleted. The SEA has been updated accordingly.

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
	Examination process to determine whether the public benefits are sufficient to outweigh the harm to heritage assets, and to scrutinise whether proposed housing numbers can be accommodated in a way which positively reinforces the distinctive character of the area in the way the SEA asserts.		
Section 9 Policy FM18. Settlement boundary	If sites are to be allocated they must be included within the settlement boundary; otherwise the plan will not be consistent with the Local Plan	London and Wessex Limited	Policy FM17 makes clear that new housing development can take place on allocated sites outside of the defined settlement Boundary. The Local Plan Countryside policy recognises that the larger villages will form the focus of growth, and allows for development on sites that are not yet allocated and lie outside the currently defined settlement boundary = e.g. at Sturminster Newton land to the north of Northfields. The Buckland Newton Plan is not in North Dorset. No further action required
Section 9 Policy FM19. Land South of Home Farm (Site 20)	This site is particularly open and acts as an attractive rural entrance into Fontmell Magna from the southern approach. Whilst there is a tree belt to the north between existing dwellings, the site is flat and open with a long roadside hedge. It is visible from the Strip Lynchets (Scheduled Ancient Monument) to the east of the site. No listed buildings are directly affected by the proposed development of this site. The proposals for 40 no. dwellings, school drop off facility and car park, whilst offering community benefits (if they are delivered), will due to the scale and traffic management harm the unique rural qualities of the Conservation Area and views from the higher ground in the AONB. The scoring on p.41 of the SEA highlighted the impacts on the	NDCC Conservation Team	Following further discussions with the Conservation Team, the policy has reduced the number of dwellings proposed to not exceed 30 dwellings Amend second paragraph to read: "The total number of dwellings should not exceed 30 units..." Amend third paragraph to read: "...and will be based on a thorough understanding of the character of the Conservation Area and views from the AONB." Amend fourth paragraph by inserting after the first sentence "This should include a substantial landscaped edge along the south-west and south-east boundaries, and a pepper-potting of green landscaped spaces within the site"

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
	historic environment and the constraints of this sensitive site. This should be revisited and the proposed development reduced, or the mitigation greatly enhanced to reduce the substantial harm likely to result.		Amend penultimate paragraph to read "Vehicular access will be provided via a new junction off the A350, designed in a manner appropriate to the Conservation Area and Rural Roads Protocol, and with the aim of reducing traffic speeds of all vehicles travelling in both directions along the A350 to under 30mph." Amend supporting text accordingly to include reference to poor state of site 20
Section 9 Policy FM19. Land South of Home Farm (Site 20)	Given the importance of the need to respect the historic characteristics of the village, it is suggested that Policy FM19, whilst referring to the criteria laid out by Policy FM7, should make the point that the proposed Home Farm allocation is made having regard to the Conservation Area Appraisal	Pennyfarthing Homes	The policy already makes clear that the design and layout, scale, massing and materials must be based on a thorough understanding of the character of the Conservation Area. No further action required
Section 9 Policy FM 19. Land South of Home Farm (Site 20)	Reword requirements for the provision of a car parking area to be based on the school's specific requirements and be solely for their use (in order to inconsiderate parking to the inconvenience of residents).	Pennyfarthing Homes	Noted – however requiring the provision to be solely for the school use would prohibit possible benefits of shared uses, so it is not considered that this restriction is necessary in planning terms. Wording amended based on latest evidence of school's requirements "A parking area for 20 cars for parents of school children to use should be provided in the area close to the site entrance off the A350, with a new footpath link to the School that avoids crossing roads. Provision must also be made in the northern corner of the site closest to the school for coach drop-off and collection."
Section 9 Policy FM20. Land at Blandfords Farm Barn (Site 22)	This policy should make clear the criteria for eligibility and demonstrating local need – eg based on the Self-Build Register. Also consider whether this site would still be suitable for residential	NDDC	Policy FM20 amended to allow for self-build or affordable housing. Amend supporting text to reference local needs to be assessed in accordance with the latest Local Housing Needs Assessment or reference to the Local Planning

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
	development in the absence of a self-build need, and if appropriate reflect this in the policy.		Authority's Self-Build and Affordable Housing Registers
Section 9 Policy FM20. Land at Blandfords Farm Barn (Site 22)	The site runs behind a number of listed buildings along West Street, and any development will need to respect their setting, and not harm this character. The cumulative impact with Site 20, is considered to be harmful to the character of the setting of the Conservation Area.	NDDC Conservation Team	Barn Cottage and No 61 do back onto the site, but there is an intervening field and house between that pair and the site, and as such the setting is considered unlikely to be harmed by this allocation (as confirmed by the KMHG report). The same applies to vehicular access off West Street, if required. Such access already exists and traffic volumes are unlikely to change significantly. Reference to onward road link (in advantages) deleted – to reference only footpath potential.
Section 9 Policy FM21. Rural Exception Sites for Affordable Housing	If the policy is to be retained it is suggested that it explicitly sets out that the effect of the policy is not to allocate the sites and this should also be reflected in any mapping. It is not considered reasonable to expect applicants to justify why sites outside of their control are not being taken forward.	NDDC	Noted – however the size and location of the rural exception site will depend on the level of unmet need, and is unlikely to require the full extent shown. Given that this need can be met through the existing Local Plan policy it is considered that the policy can be deleted, although reference to the potential of both sites being explored in the future can be retained in the text. Policy FM21 deleted.
Section 9 Policy FM21. Rural Exception Sites for Affordable Housing	Considers that although Site 1 lies within the Conservation Area, its development will not impact on the setting of listed buildings, and would cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However Site 24 is relatively open from all aspects, so development will fundamentally change the character and appearance of the rural fields, potentially harming the setting of the listed buildings on West Street, and the character of the Conservation Area	NDDC Conservation Team	See above. Amend final bullet of disadvantages to "...and rural character of Conservation Area"

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
Section 9 Policy FM21. Rural Exception Sites for Affordable Housing	Site 1 is located immediately adjoining the sewage treatment works and is a site proposed for allocation for housing. There is no evidence at this stage to suggest that any development on this land would be acceptable	London and Wessex Limited	See above Policy FM21 deleted.
Section 9 Policy FM21. Rural Exception Sites for Affordable Housing	Site 24 partly overlaps with the pattern of open spaces identified on Map 7	London and Wessex Limited	See above Policy FM21 deleted.
SEA	We have reviewed the document and we consider that the document has identified the relevant issues, objectives and assessment criteria for the plan area.	Environment Agency	Support noted – no further action
SEA	<p>Table 8 (p22) sets out a Summary Assessment of the Site Options. It asserts that there will be “neutral impact” on Cultural Heritage arising from the allocation of sites 1 & 22; it is not clear how this is informed by the Heritage Assessment. Sites 20 & 24 will have “adverse impact”.</p> <p>In the Summary Assessment of the Plan’s site allocation policies on pp23 &24 it concludes that the proposals will not cause substantial harm and should strengthen the underlying character of the village. Table 10 showing the Cumulative Impacts now asserts that the impact on Cultural Heritage from allocating site 20 will be positive overall whereas that from sites 22, 1 & 24 will be neutral. Given previous evidence referred to this presumably regards the potential for positive design to be sufficient to overcome the harm caused by the site allocations themselves, as</p>	Historic England NDDC	Table 8 is brought forward from the options stage assessment (see Appx 3). Para 9.10 explains that this assessment was informed with input from the NDDC Conservation team. Unlike Table 8 (which was based on an assessment with no policies in place to specifically secure effective mitigation), Table 9 includes an assessment of the site-specific policies including mitigation measures to address the potential harm identified. In relation to heritage matters, 9.16 explains that this stage of the assessment was based on a report by Kevin Morris Heritage Planning (a former NDDC Conservation Manager) who had been provided with the draft policies. The report was published during the consultation as part of the supporting evidence base.

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
	might be inferred from para 11.1 (p25). We strongly dispute the basis and appropriateness of this conclusion.		This is based on the updated assessment as supplied by Kevin Morris Heritage Planning, a qualified heritage expert. However further concerns raised by the NDDC Conservation team have led to additional revisions being considered in relation to site 20's allocation. This is explained in the revised assessments.
SEA	There is a slight contradiction between heritage impacts as assessed on Page 23 of the SEA and in its Appx 3. It is recommended that the reference to 'only limited development' is omitted from the SA in Appx 3.	Pennyfarthing Homes	Appx 3 is a record of the options based assessment based on feedback obtained from NDDC at that time and in the absence of specific policy wording. The additional technical work undertaken since, and plan drafting, has resulted in the revised wording included in the main SEA. No changes considered necessary
SEA	There is a slight discrepancy where the SA suggests that constraining features could limit the development potential of Site 20 to less than 10 dwellings, and should be considered to accommodate employment generating use.	Pennyfarthing Homes	See above No change
SEA	It is important that the submission plan sets out how the SEA process has informed the choices being made in the plan as set out in national guidance.	NDDC	There is no requirement in national guidance for the SEA process to be explicitly noted in the Neighbourhood Plan. This a required in the post-adoption statement – however information to inform this can be provided as an addition at this stage SEA to be mentioned in Foreword and/or Executive Summary. Add to end of foreward (before section of thanks from Parish Council): "The Neighbourhood Plan's preparation was accompanied by a Strategic Environmental Assessment which scrutinised the potential site allocations and policies in terms of their likely impact on the environment. This meant that possible harm could be avoided

Section	Main issues raised	Respondent/s	Suggested response
			through careful site selection and the inclusion of specific mitigation measures in the policies themselves.”
SEA	The assessment of reasonable options does not appear to have fully explored the options of the Plan allocating different amounts of land in relation to the housing need identified for example a no-development scenario or meeting a figure of 30 or 40 dwellings, and the scale of development in the plan as proposed.	NDDC	One of the plan’s objectives is to promote a range of mixed housing development appropriate to local needs over the period to 2031. As such a no-development scenario would not be considered a reasonable option. The submission draft has reduced the number of dwellings on site 20 and deleted policy 21, reducing the level of proposed development to more closely align with the projected need.