

The Pre-submission Consultation for the Fontmell Magna Neighbourhood Plan was held over 2nd October to 20th November 2017.

This document shows a collation of all the comments received from parish residents in the returned questionnaires, including those from The Mead residents group.

There were 145 responses from residents. 51 respondents made no comments. 6 commented only to provide compliments and thanks, while 8 provided only compliments and support for the Plan.

In this document the comments are grouped by policy/project/section/paragraph of the draft Plan.

The final column “Response” shows the action taken by the NP Working Group in response to the comments provided or where no action is thought appropriate.

Ref	Comments	Response
p. iv	If the Plan is not approved until 2018, should that be the date shown in the 1st paragraph, also of p. viii, last paragraph?	Change considered but not thought necessary.
Consistency	p.(i) Foreword – “village shop and tea-room”, p.37 6.1 “village shop and post office”, p.38 FM13 “Village Stores, Post Office and Café”.	Change all three to: “village shop, post office and tea-room”
Forms	- Generally - these forms FAR TOO COMPLICATED and so this will affect take-up response. - You have asked for 'Yes' or 'No'. Some of my answers - both 'Yes' and 'No' are in need of qualification. - With only YES/NO options it is difficult to disagree with most of the generic policies. The Devil is on the detail.	The Project Team tried to keep the form as simple as possible.
General	Two respondents objected to any future developments in Fontmell Magna, except with regard to the traffic.	Noted – no further action.
General	(New resident) Road signage -support improvement/collaborative efforts to improve condition of road signage, especially highways signage beside/opposite Fontmell inn - it detracts from the quality/attractiveness of the village. Signs badly degraded! Dog friendly/dog owner responsible village - very many owners including myself, support/foster dog friendly walking - suitable footpaths, maintained access - sites/dog paddles/poop bin. Dogs greatly beneficial to people's health and wellbeing/social contacts!	Noted. This was not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.
General	Do not understand why all the maps showing the village of Fontmell Magna do not show the properties adjacent to Pipers Mill Bridge when the road signs on the approach from Bedchester clearly displays the village sign (as attached PDF from Google Maps).	Pipers Mill is outside the Conservation Area and was not the subject of any proposed development.
1.5 P2	We would like to see the following minor change to 1.5 - “... these streams are prone to surface water and groundwater flooding, notably those adjacent to Site 20.”	Point covered by para. 3 of FM 11.
1.7 P3	This states that the 2016 North Dorset Local Plan focuses on the housing and economic growth around the main towns and the role of larger villages is to focus on local needs. The housing recommendations of the Neighbourhood Plan go beyond its own sizing of the “local need” - why?	NDDC LP1 figures on which our original estimates were based have been superseded by the Eastern Dorset SHMA 2015 and should be increased by 14%. We need to be sure that our figures will not be challenged
1.10 P4	Totally agree with this vision – fairly certain that what is proposed will seriously undermine its achievement.	Noted, it is important that our policies preserve the vision.
1.13 P7	2nd line should read in this respect, developers would be REQUIRED to:	Change discussed but not agreed.
1.14 P8	The Plan looks forward to 2031 – but it is clear that the proposals are likely looking forward to housing beyond the local need within a period of 2-3 years. This conflicts with some objectives immediately.	The Plan sets out a strategy for meeting the housing needs of the parish over the period 2017-31.
FM1	3 separate responses questioned the appropriateness of including green spaces that were private gardens (i.e. those numbered 5, 6, 7, 8 & 16)	All LGS sites have been reviewed and 3 sites have been withdrawn, numbered N05, W02, W06. The decision criteria are available on the parish website, as part of the evidence base of the Plan.

Ref	Comments	Response
FM1	Fontmell House paddock and the two fields opposite 33 Mill Street should be designated green spaces. Both sites as housing estates would be very visible from the downs and increase existing traffic passage to and from Parsonage St. and Mill St.	These sites were considered and rejected as they do not meet the criteria.
FM1 Item 7 P10	The fact that the Plan proposes a large housing estate right next to the A350 to the south of the village rather undermines the value of the dominant planting making a “visual entrance” to the village.	It is important that our policies on layout and design are strong enough to stop the “visual entrance” being undermined.
FM1 & FM2	The map of Local Green Spaces excludes local farm land. A big block of houses will do far more damage than several small ones.	Noted.
FM2	Strongly support protection of wildlife corridors.	Support noted – no further action.
FM2	The wildlife corridor in the areas of the pylons where a large number of birds gather morning and evening should be included.	No change. Pylons are not wildlife corridors as they do not provide habitat or protection
FM2 Maps	The Home Farm garden triangle with its hedge appears on Maps 1,3,4,7 and 12 but not on Maps 2,8,10 and 11. This requires rectification as Map 7 gives a plan of open spaces which we support as part of an important buffer zone to any adjoining development.	Parish Online only shows the triangle at certain scales.
FM2 Maps	The triangle of land owned by Home Farm, bordering the footpath and lane to Perry's yard is included in Map 7 but not Map 4 Wildlife Corridors/Local Green Spaces and established hedgerows (9.19). There is an established hedgerow on western border/filed border and if the land was included in the NP it would provide a buffer of land between the proposed site 20 and the properties in The Mead and alongside the A350. Please consider its inclusion.	The land has been assessed for inclusion as a Green Space but the landowner has objected.
FM2	Include the old sheep wash in Mill St	This is already included as a wildlife corridor.
FM2 2.5	Parsons Hollow, the old road to Sutton Waldron, should be included into Table 2. It is very widely used as an amenity walk, but damaged and made dangerous for walkers and horse riders by off-road recreational vehicles.	Discussed but rejected as too far from the settlement.
FM2 2.6 P12	Map 4 shows the local wildlife corridors in and around Fontmell Magna. Routes radiate out in all directions yet nothing is shown to the South West of the village despite the treeline from Home Farm being a key element of the footpath to large wooded areas to the South West and Sutton Waldron. This is a well-established wildlife corridor (frequent deer sightings for example) and very busy footpath used by villagers throughout the day, affording open views to the AONB to the East.	Last sentence of FM2.6 mentions hedgerows as links and this hedge on the north of site 20 is shown as an established hedgerow.
FM2 2.8 P13	Site 20 represents a large green space for the South West of the village. In general terms, small scale development to the East of the village is the best direction to preserve the balance. Carefully planned this could occur in compliance with the desire to minimise development in the direction of the AONB to the East.	FM4 (as amended) makes it clear that we are not trying to ‘balance’ development (on either side of the A350) but to site it where our work has shown that it is sustainable.
FM3	To be included as an important view, is the view towards Sutton Waldron from the rear of West Street properties facing south.	Discussed but not considered an important view; no change.
FM3	All the village is seen from some areas.	Noted.
FM3	Impressions of the village from the A350 are also very important.	Agreed.

Ref	Comments	Response
FM3	The view SW from below the C13 looking down Longcombe Bottom has been described as "One of the ten best views in England" (Daily Telegraph travel section c.1985) and surely should be included as 'View of Fontmell Magna from the head of Longcombe' and featured on Map5.	Viewpoint will be included in the updated Plan.
FM3 & FM4	The extent of the visually sensitive area is too large, and could be reduced without impact on the views from the downs. Further small development adjacent to current dwellings would not impact to the extent stated in the proposed plan. This policy will inevitably lead to skewed development in the village, isolating services to the east of the village, and over-burdening the west. I think that it is wrong to have a blanket statement of no development in this area, and would like to see some consideration of small numbers or individual development.	In-fill development may be acceptable.
FM4	The views from the village towards Fontmell Down and the Strip Lynchets are an important visual element of the area. Strongly support FM4.	Noted
FM4	There are other visually sensitive areas that can be viewed from the AONB.	Noted
FM4	No definitive of AONB given, no obvious boundary, significance - is it (unreadable) or proposed?	Noted
FM4	Policy FM4 feels to me to be overstating the case. The AONB would not be adversely affected if small-scale development of plots adjacent to existing properties was to be done sensitively. This would ease the overall development burden on the West of the village, taking pressure off the already identified traffic issues on West Street.	In-fill development may be acceptable but access to the A350 is a major issue.
FM4	Totally agree with the general thrust of this Policy. However, as expressed in The Plan, this policy is unreasonably sweeping as carefully planned small scale developments could help in balancing the impact of local housing needs (unlike the scale of development being proposed for Site 20).	Noted. In-fill development may be acceptable.
FM4 2.13 P15	As mentioned in Item 6 above, small scale development would not by itself jeopardise the need to minimise undesirable development trends towards the AONB. It is, in fact, well placed to preserve balance. Small scale development will balance traffic flows to some degree and need not be dominant. A very large development (in Village terms) in Site 20 is a "slap in the face" for anyone who knows the village as it is today.	Most of this is already dealt with in the previous point. 'The village as it is today' is a result of a continuing process of expansion (see CAA page 8). (Some of the signatories of this document were residents in the village before St Andrew's View was built.)
FM4 Map 5 P16	The currently proposed development for Site 20 (and any other large-scale development) will impact upon this view. The best approach to minimising such impact from high ground around the village is to keep any individual development small in scale.	Any development will impact on views from the AONB, our policies on layout and design will minimise this.
FM5	Why not West Street?	Agreed to start the rural road to Bedchester from the Village hall rather than Pipers Mill.
FM5	This policy is also a bit sweeping in scope and could eliminate excellent sites for small scale development. It is possible to be compliant with this policy but still allow small developments off Mill Street and Parsonage Street as part of "distributed growth" without seriously impacting existing residents and traffic flows.	FM5 was included because of public support for it. No sites in Parsonage Street were submitted to us and any entrance to site 12 (north of Mill Street) would cause harm to the rural character of Mill Street.

Ref	Comments	Response
FM6	Fully agree with this policy – but is it likely that a significant development as proposed for Site 20 (which will include homes for the open market) will comply?	Policy FM6 wording has been strengthened.
FM6	Advice from the Commission for Dark Skies is available. See www.britastro.org/dark-skies	Noted.
FM7	Surely unlisted buildings would require planning permission for any (unreadable) work. Should (unreadable) subject to blanket restrictions?	Noted, but no change agreed.
FM7	No need to conserve pump house at Middle Hill	Noted, but wording retained.
FM7	Environmental and conservation questions will inevitably arise wherever there is new development, but decisions have to be made alongside the North Dorset Local Plan and it seems to us that the Collyers Brook and Mill Street area are far more sensitive than the flat land adjacent to the A350 at sites 20 and 22, again strong reasons to prefer the latter and to reject sites 10 and 12.	Noted.
FM7 3.1 P20	The implied criticism of St. Andrew’s View architectural style seems a bit extreme – in the context of the development planned for Site 20 it is likely to be regarded as magnificent. It is very unlikely that a development of 40 houses with a bias towards the “affordable” will ever be greatly compatible with the rural nature of the village!	The proposed development for Site 20 has been reduced to a maximum of 30 houses. FM8 and FM9 are designed to make any development enhance the character of the village.
FM7 3.2 P22	It seems rather ironic that approval is required before a conservatory can be added to an existing property within the Conservation Area but a development of 40 houses is likely to proceed with minimal compliance with the rural nature of the village (indeed, will destroy the rural nature of the village to the South West).	See last point.
FM8	Very much agree with this policy statement but can only echo doubts about compliance. It would be useful to extend the policy for “village edge” to include a “boundary with pre-existing residential property.”	Noted
FM8	Sites 1 and 24 would increase traffic on West Street already overloaded. Other sites side-lined? Surely best development is small sites scattering houses around village (unreadable) is based on those sites proposed at the beginning. Takes no account of further land becoming available and is therefore excluded even if better for the village.	It is not expected that Sites 1 and 24 would be developed within the period of the Plan, ie. to 2031.
FM8	2 respondents commented that affordable housing should be grouped in clusters, while another said that mixing affordable housing with home ownership is not a workable idea.	Noted, but the Plan is following Local Plan Policy.
FM8	Given the proposed development of site 20, I don’t understand why it is stated that “the village edge is a transition area and is to be protected by a lower density of development”. It will be a higher density than anywhere else in the village.	The maximum number of houses permitted on site 20 reduced to 30.

Ref	Comments	Response
FM8 3.3 P23	Totally agree with this paragraph. However, development of 40 houses on Site 20 will be precisely like the denser suburban areas found in towns and totally out of balance with village development. A smaller development with houses in the Northern section of Site 20 combined with those in Site 22 (but divided by the existing treeline) would create a single logical site much closer to the goals of the Neighbourhood Plan. This single logical site could provide around 20-25 houses over both physical sites and in conjunction with other small developments around the village satisfy both local needs (the priority) and some additional housing capacity. This maintains a green space to the South West of the village with links to the West and East. This may or may not jeopardise the desirable school drop-off zone – but does the character of the village have to be severely impacted by two busy periods in West Street (some of which is likely to continue anyway) for around 30 minutes per period on five days per week for 42 weeks of the year!	The maximum number of houses permitted on site 20 reduced to 30.
FM8 3.5 P24	Very much agree with the need to avoid excessive housing density and the figure of 12dph seems reasonable (based on St. Andrew’s View being 11.8dph). However, it depends on how this is measured – would roads and the school drop-off zone be included in the measurement to achieve compliance when the density of “housing” is in reality non-compliant? We would anticipate a density higher than 12dph as this is the trend for “modern housing” and maximises the Developer’s profits.	FM8 is updated to remove housing density as a direct condition.
FM8 & FM9	I consider style and scale most important.	Noted – no further action.
FM9	3 respondents questioned the removal of permitted development rights of second storey loft conversions. This is an affordable way for growing families (the demographic breakdown shows a significant drop in the numbers of residents between 28 and 45) to remain in the village. The conservation area planning restrictions already restrain excessive loft conversions. “I have lived here for many years and cannot say that I have witnessed loft conversions springing up across the village”. Proliferation of ground floor extensions build under P.D.R. without any design control will also erode the character of the Conservation Area. Surely within the Conservation Area Article 3 and 4 powers should be implemented.	Policy FM9 wording amended to clarify PDR rights.
FM9	Secondly, the Plan suggests building affordable houses that are adaptable 'to suit future housing needs': should this not also be extended to existing residents?	Policy FM9 wording amended to clarify PDR rights.
FM9	Agree very much with this policy. Based on observations of developments in Shaftesbury, the appearance of a housing development is greatly affected by the parking of cars. As an example, despite the provision of two off-road parking spaces to each house the large number of cars per home, combined with an apparent unwillingness to use the off-road parking (garages become storage areas), results in cars parking partly on pavements both sides of the road. Not sure how this can be remedied!	Noted – no change.
FM9 3.8 P26	It is very difficult to see how a development of 40 houses within the defined conservation area that includes Site 20 could ever enhance the character of the village or even be neutral.	See amended Policies FM8 & FM9

Ref	Comments	Response
FM9 3.12 P26	Agree with the views on materials and design features. However, although not a major issue, the dislike of PVC-u might be going a bit too far. As some of the properties are targeted on retired people the use of even hardwood products results in eventual deterioration (paint and wood finishes do not seem to be what they were in aiding longevity and the cost of scaffolding is significant). PVC-u products are much improved and certainly reduce maintenance overheads.	In view of our concern about climate change and sustainability we should avoid the use of plastic products.
FM10	Please add horses on roads v speeding traffic	Noted – no further action.
FM10	<u>Pedestrian routes must be safeguarded.</u> The criteria for the plan requires that pedestrian routes must be safeguarded, yet the proposals are for building that feeds into West Street, a key area that is already overloaded with traffic and is without pavements. Additional housing and its subsequent increase in traffic load is really only workable for sites that feed directly onto the main road (A350). This would allow traffic calming measures to be focussed on the main road - 20mph, gates, etc.	The Plan proposes development to Sites 20 and 22 which would be accessed via the A350.
FM10	I do not agree with the statement that no paths equate to a look of rural roads. It is the hedgerows that are the biggest feature. This statement will negate any concern over pedestrian safety and future needs of other road users. The plan needs to consider that traffic will continue to rise, and safe areas for pedestrians will encourage more short journeys on foot e.g. children walking to school from Bedchester or Sutton Waldron.	Noted –no further action.
FM10	Policy FM10 suggests new safe walking or cycling ways and I wholeheartedly agree, however, I feel less convinced of their need for a rural character. It seems to me that the existing pedestrian or cycle routes are unsafe precisely because of this nature: for example, the raised pavement on Lurmer Street that abruptly stops as it reaches a bend on the main road. There will be solutions to this issue of balance but I would not support the repetition of an existing problem simply to maintain 'character'. Project P1 is something I certainly endorse. The traffic on West Street has become very dense during School drop-off/collection times and I have seen several near misses as children have been walking to school. The speed limit reduction would also be a good idea.	Support noted.
FM10	Ensure that any new development causing inevitable increase in road use considers the dangerous section of road through the village on A350.	Noted
FM10	4 respondents favoured reducing speed limits on the A350 to 20mph to improve traffic/pedestrian safety, as well as on West Street and Mill Street.	This is under consideration by DCC Highways. Roads are not within the scope of the Plan.
FM10	We definitely need more pedestrian routes and where possible widening of roads.	Noted
FM10	Proposed new footpath along Collyers Brook - <u>not</u> good for wildlife disturbance.	Noted
FM10	Would like to see more reference and inclusion to exploring connections and footpaths from Hartgrove and Bedchester that avoids fast moving traffic along the connecting lanes.	This is something for the Parish Council to pursue.

Ref	Comments	Response
FM10	General agreement – but there does seem to be excessive focus on cycle routes to village amenities as we are only addressing short distances of no more than 300m or so. Where necessary, surely a combined footpath / cycle path is required – drawing a white line down the middle for cycles one side and pedestrians the other (as in parts of Salisbury) just does not work. It is most likely that a low-end / affordable development will result in cars littering the streets. We feel that a distributed, smaller scale development housing strategy offers a better solution in avoiding these problems.	Noted
FM10	Much depends on what happens on the A350 so impossible to evaluate.	Noted
FM10 4.4 P29	General agreement to the points made about traffic issues. However, while the parking issues at school arrival / departure times are very real, they are of short duration and can be overstated. Many school users will most likely continue to utilise current practices despite the presence of a drop-off zone (this has been observed at another Dorset school following provision of a drop-off zone).	Noted
FM10 4.7 P30	With the proposed 2 parking spaces per property and car parking for at least 20 cars and 1 coach, the increased traffic onto and exiting the A350, would make an already dangerous stretch of road, very much more so.	Noted. Extensive discussions have been held with DCC Highways to improve the safety of the A350 route.
FM10 4.7 P30	Agree very strongly with proposed new lane from South St. Hopefully access to surgery and school could be included.	Support noted
FM10 4.7 P30	Should a link be made to the A350 we feel strongly that this should not be of a form that automatically forces existing users on the A350 to slow down significantly before continuing (e.g. traffic lights or roundabout). There has been some talk on the idea of using the junction to slow down traffic from the South prior to entering the village. However, the volume of existing A350 traffic will be much greater than that to / from the new development and if it is automatically slowed it will still accelerate again resulting in increased engine roar / pollution for residents in the area (particularly from HGVs grinding through the gears). Speed control is an emotive issue and the only effective solution is real enforcement (i.e. speed cameras and convictions) – but, apparently, nobody wants to spend the money to make this happen!	A junction of any sort will slow traffic at the entrance to the village.
FM10 Project 1	While sceptical about the benefits of some solutions being proposed, we are in general agreement with the aims of this Project. The only real solution is speed reduction and the 20mph limits will be helpful as long as they are not extended unreasonably (drivers will then most likely ignore them). Enforcement is needed but this has been commented upon earlier.	Noted
FM10 Project 1	4 respondents objected to the A350 proposals, in particular traffic lights/one-way priorities etc. 1 also objected that the Plan does not address problems caused by parking on public highways - much of this by residents.	The Plan merely states that it supports the Parish Council's Traffic Management Scheme. Issues with that Scheme should be taken up with the Parish Council.
FM11	No mention is made of the mud and detritus flowing down from Parsons Hollow into Parsonage Lane in wet winters, even proceeding as far as the A350 entrance to Parsonage St. While there have been works to the drainage, there is still a serious threat of flooding opposite Scallow Cottage. This should be recorded.	This is a matter for the Parish Council.

Ref	Comments	Response
FM11 5.1 P34	We would appreciate some additional emphasis here, such as "... and can affect the development itself, pre-existing housing nearby and development beyond the site ...".	Paragraph 5.4 of the Plan will include references to the potential flood risk.
FM11 Section 5 P34-36	This aspect is of great concern to many of the existing properties bordering Site 20 to the North East. There are major problems experienced by this pre-existing housing during and after extended periods of wet weather (particularly in the winter period) due to excessive surface water and slow drainage resulting from the nature of underlying geology. Septic tank systems become flooded and effectively fail completely. This problem might be adversely affected further by any large-scale development of Site 20. Offering nearby housing the opportunity to connect to the development site's mains drainage system offers a solution to this recurrent problem.	Propose to Pennyfarthing Homes that they offer a sewage system connection to houses adjacent to site 20.
FM12	Seems to be irrelevant considering the number of properties within the OCZ. Presumably any proposed development south of OCZ may also impact on the sewage treatment works.	Noted
FM12	Sewage Treatment Works: this displays an odour consultation zone which covers site 12, however, Map12 displays only part of the site as an odour zone.	Inconsistency will be corrected.
FM12	Odour problems/sewage works. What about the people who already live in this zone? Smells should be eradicated and houses built on close by sites would be fine too.	This is an operational matter, for Wessex Water.
FM13	Especially the surgery.	Noted
FM13	I'd like to see more facilities provided in the Village Hall such as sports equipment (e.g. table tennis and badminton) and Wi-Fi connectivity. Also, two respondents thought there should be an audio loop system for people with hearing impairment.	Limited support for this.
FM13 6.2 P37	There has recently been a significant change to the high-level governance of St. Andrew's School – i.e. compulsory integration into the Shaftesbury Academy. Has an opinion been sought from the Academy on the likelihood of their future plans involving some rationalisation of Primary Schools that could result in the closure of St. Andrew's School in the relatively near future? This is obviously important with regard to the priority of providing the new drop-off zone in Site 20. Also, will a possible increase in the future number of children from Fontmell Magna itself (i.e. those from the additional 50 houses) significantly reduce the number arriving by car or bus, thereby making the drop-off zone less important / beneficial? The School has definite limits to its capacity.	A meeting was held on 8 th January 2018 with the Acting Head of St Andrews School. The Head stated the Academy plans for a growth in roll numbers at St Andrews and there are no plans for any rationalisation.
FM13 7.8	I strongly support the provision of a community facility available for small-scale employment or business activities, craft skills and for recreational use.	Noted
FM13 7.8:	Using Site 22 for business activities should not be considered until access from the A350 has been properly secured. The farm track is too narrow and there are safety issues particularly for Fontmell Under 5's.	Noted
FM13 Project 3	Footpath West St.-South St. must be in consultation with landowners.	Noted
FM15 Project 4	The Parish Council should sponsor the development of a Parish website, promoting Parish Council activities, Springhead, Village Shop, the Fontmell pub, tourism and small businesses.	The Parish Council has initiated a project to improve the website.
FM14	Is there a contradiction between the specification that expansion of only established businesses will or may be supported and the provision for possible new business premises at site 22?	No conflict is recognised.
FM15	If NEW development of any type is better, it should/must be encouraged and supported.	Noted

Ref	Comments	Response
FM15	5 respondents felt that it was important to support local businesses and that competition should be encouraged; new restrictions may stop new businesses.	FM15 amended to clarify.
FM15 Project 4	I support this in principle, but it needs to be backed up by a written Parish Council "Plan for Implementation".	Noted
FM16	Experience over 20 years has shown a need for more bungalows of good quality - some for down-sizing. At least two parking spaces for <u>every</u> new property.	Noted
FM16	Keep the village character.	Noted
FM16	Housing types - perhaps ratio 70:30.	Noted
FM16	I think it is important that affordable housing rather than executive housing should take priority.	Noted
FM16	This policy, although allowing for downsizing for the largest population of the village, will not necessarily support growth of other age demographics, and in particular families who would like to send their children to the primary school. The 3 to 4+ bedroom properties vacated by downsizers in the village will inevitably be only accessible to those on high incomes due to the high house prices in this area. I would recommend consideration of a higher percentage of 3 or more bedroom affordable homes in the village, as so far only 12 larger properties out of 30 are proposed, and the proportion of affordable family homes will be approximately 2! This hardly encourages young families into the village to sustain the village school.	The policy reflects the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment.
FM16	How can one define "affordable"? The policy promotes smaller houses so that locals can down size. These properties would then go on the market at a price higher than local young families could afford - Not what is required. A good proportion of new homes/houses should be social to rent (housing association or similar). Difficult with little local employment but we must try to keep and encourage younger families.	The proportion of affordable housing in a development is determined by the NDDC.
FM16	It is disappointing that the opportunity to create housing for the retired, elderly and frail or for people needing day to day support with care and activities has not been considered given that there is a probable need to free up premises which are no longer suitable for these groups.	Noted, although only one comment received on this.
FM16	2 respondents questioned the use of one bed homes within FM.	Noted
FM16	Concern that allowing residents to increase size of their property will reduce the stock of smaller properties for future residents.	Noted
FM16	Unclear on the implications of this Policy (and the NP in general) on anyone wishing to build 4/5 bedroom houses on an infill site they may already own.	In-fill development may be acceptable.
FM16	While it is appropriate to meet housing needs care should be taken to no over-develop for the wrong reasons especially when this would mean that construction would be condensed rather than spread out over the period to 2031.	Noted
FM16	Max. 2 storeys essential.	Noted
FM16	Unless exceptionally well designed, bungalows detract from the build environment. Carefully planned or adapted small houses can be suitable for the elderly. The use of stair lifts and internal lifts can enable the elderly to stay in their own homes without the need to relocate to a bungalow.	Noted

Ref	Comments	Response
FM16 8.2 P45	Why has a local target of 30-35 homes (we think we have seen a lower figure than this in an earlier version of the Plan) over a 15-year period to 2031 morphed into ~50 homes ... probably over a 2-year period?	The figure of 50 homes is not used in the Plan. The updated Plan sets the overall scale of development at 35 homes up to 2031.
FM16, Section 8	Housing Needs should address wider rather than narrower needs so as to make affordable housing available to the widest possible range of local people.	Noted
FM17	2 respondents accepted the need for 40 new homes in the village by 2031, but did not think all 40 should be on one site.	Policy FM17 modified to say "This Plan makes provision for 30 to 35 new homes..."
FM17	The number of new properties built in Fontmell Magna up to 2031 must not exceed 40.	The policy will be amended to set the maximum at 30 homes.
FM17	Given the availability of development plots presently I understand that building may take place West of the A350 - but does Policy FM17 preclude any sites that may become available for 2031 from being used?	Comment not understood.
FM17	14 respondents were strongly against the development of site 12, for reasons that include: the access from Mill Street is restricted and inadequate; Mill Street itself with only informal and restricted passing places is wholly unsuitable to any more traffic; the road is popular with walkers and ramblers and more traffic on the narrow approach road with no pedestrian facilities is a safety concern; it would likely harm the narrow, pretty, rural road character; it would mean the destruction of a large section of established hedgerow; further extend the settlement boundary to the north east within close proximity to the AONB and imposes on the historical landscape of Fontmell Down; it would likely harm heritage assets (including the listed Glyn Gift Cottage and historic Middle Mill dam) as well as other properties identified as unlisted but which contribute to the character of the area, as identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal, and other nearby properties; crossing the A350 for pedestrians to access village facilities too hazardous; within a conservation area; crosses public footpath; the level of site is some 1-1.5 metres higher than the adjoining properties at Collyers Rise and this from time to time causes problems with surface water flooding which would be considerably increased by the installation of hard surfaces.; overlooking rear gardens of adjoining houses in Collyers Rise; the owner of the site has produced "anonymous" and misleading documentation. 6 respondents were in favour of developing site 12 as part of developing smaller sites.	The Plan does not support the development of site 12.
FM18	Seems somewhat random in its inclusions and exclusions.	Noted

Ref	Comments	Response
FM19	<p>7 respondents commented that they were in full agreement with the site 20 proposals, one saying that they would far rather have a housing estate on the outskirts of the village than in the middle of it (although we must insist fringing the whole estate with trees, so it can't be seen from the road) and one emphasising the need for a mixed housing development of site 20 (the site must provide a spectrum of 1 - 4 bed houses in both open and affordable houses).</p> <p>Arguments in support were easy vehicular access from the main A350, the relief of school traffic in West Street, Church Street and The Knapp, and proximity to the village's valued community facilities. Conversely sites 9,10 and 12 would all involve crossing the A350 at hazardous points to reach amenities, and sites 10 and 12 would disgorge traffic into <u>Mill Street</u>, which is narrow, twisty and steep in the easterly direction and already threatened with increased volumes if the recently approved distillery at Springhead Farm comes into being. Furthermore, these three sites would provide no solution whatsoever to the problem of traffic congestion around the school.</p>	Support noted.
FM19	How will people in FM19 section access the A350. Would a roundabout be necessary?	That is one option.
FM19	I have an element of concern (and I hope I am wrong) that this NP could, in itself, be the trigger for the overdevelopment of Fontmell Magna.	Noted

Ref	Comments	Response
FM19	<p>21 respondents agreed with development on site 20 (and, generally, with the need for 40 houses by 2031), but 13 thought 30-40 houses on site 20 was too many (but without specifying a maximum)</p> <p>4 thought there should be a maximum of 30</p> <p>1 thought there should be a maximum of 20</p> <p>1 thought a limit of 10-20</p> <p>1 thought a maximum of 10</p> <p>1 said "far fewer houses"</p> <p>These respondents thought either that development would be better spread over several sites rather than concentrated in one, or that development would be better spread over the period to 2031, or both. However, 1 respondent thought that having new houses/cottages scattered around the village would look very odd and out of place.</p> <p>Only 1 respondent thought that site 20 should be left undeveloped. While they accepted the need to build some houses, they thought the better option would be to build small pockets of houses on sites 1, 22 and 24.</p> <p>Other comments were: To build an estate of houses anywhere in this village has got to be wrong. There should be an open meeting at this stage so we can share our views with others and debate the issues before it is too late; I was amazed with the apparent acceptance of the proposed tarmac and concrete carbuncle of forty houses to be built in an area with a high-water table and poor drainage;</p> <p>Think it is a very detailed and comprehensive plan, but have strong reservations about the proposed development of site 20;</p> <p>NOT a housing estate. This needs to be an extension to the village, not a separate entity;</p> <p>Agree as laid out in plan but not with the changes and concessions dictated by landowner and builder/developer.</p>	<p>In response to these comments, Policy FM19 has been amended as follows:</p> <p>First paragraph of Policy FM19 amended by replacing "accommodate" with "assist"</p> <p>Second paragraph of Policy FM19 amended to read: "The total number of dwellings should not exceed 30 units..."</p> <p>Third paragraph of Policy FM19 amended to read: "...and will be based on a thorough understanding of the character of the Conservation Area and views from the AONB."</p> <p>Fourth paragraph of Policy FM19 amended 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"</p> <p>Penultimate paragraph of Policy FM19 amended 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."</p> <p>Supporting text amended to describe how the development of site 20 will incorporate extensive planting and a buffer zone to improve the appearance of the southern entrance to the village.</p>
FM19 9.18 P54	<p>Would suggest that the initial sentence be modified to "... will require careful attention in accordance with Policies FM8 and FM11."</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>
FM19 9.19 P55	<p>The hedge between site 20 and the school playing field should be restored before any development is agreed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
FM20	<p>Strongly agree.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
FM20	<p>Max 10 houses.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Ref	Comments	Response
FM20	2 respondents felt that development should only be allowed if all vehicular access is via A350. The single farm track has safety issues for children attending the pre-school and the school children who use the before/after school services alongside the proposed development of the farm outbuildings and 10 housing units. There should be pedestrian access only to West street, which is already very congested especially at 9am and 3pm/school parking.	Agreed.
FM20	I would like to see the tree line and hedge row to the north boundary of site 22 retained, just as FM20 specifically mentions that the tree line and hedgerow to the southern boundary of site 22 should be retained.	Noted.
FM20	Why cannot site 22 be considered for affordable housing? Better than introducing more traffic on to West St and building too close to the peaceful setting of Brooklands Wood.	Policy is amended to allow for self-build or affordable housing.
FM20	I have great concerns about drainage in FM20. The area is clay. The field between FM20 and the Village Hall has a lot of groundwater especially after heavy rain. How will this new area of housing fare?	Noted.
FM20 Appendix 2	The proposed use of West Street as an access would create an adverse neighbour impact. This area is restricted and would have a negative impact if increased vehicular access were allowed. Therefore, point 9 of the Site Analysis table should be identified as an area that performs poorly for site 22. Congestion is caused already by traffic serving the children's nursery at Blandford Farm as well as causing damage to the shared lane directly adjacent. Any increase in traffic would create further congestion, noise and impact.	Noted – no change.
FM21	There are no direct access routes from the main road for these sites 1 and 24.	Policy FM21 will be removed.
FM21	This should be integrated into new development and not separate; should be integrated into smaller sites.	Policy FM21 will be removed.
FM21	Limited development on sites 1 & 24 to prevent too much traffic increase on West St.	Policy FM21 will be removed.
FM21	There are <u>enough</u> proposed housing development so additional "standby" plots of land should be avoided.	Policy FM21 will be removed.
FM21	Max 10 houses, spread the impact.	Policy FM21 will be removed.
Referendum	- Don't know, not without serious attention to points above. - No, not as it stands - significant changes needed.	Noted.