

Economy

For the 'Economy' chapter a total of 160 responses were received. The individual comments were broken down as follows:

Number of comments made: 160

Object: 97
Support: 49
Neutral: 14

Specific and general consultation bodies	Key landowners / developers
<i>Bridport Town Council</i>	<i>AAV Plastics</i>
<i>Dorset County Council (Environment & Economy)</i>	<i>Dorset Planning Consultant Limited</i>
<i>Dorset County Council (Minerals & Waste)</i>	<i>Hanford Holdings Limited</i>
<i>Dorset County Hospital</i>	<i>Luxury Family Hotels</i>
<i>Dorset Local Nature Partnership</i>	<i>McDonald's Restaurants Ltd UK</i>
<i>Dorchester Town Council</i>	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>
<i>Dorset Wildlife Trust</i>	<i>Portland Port Group</i>
<i>Moreton Parish Council</i>	<i>Symondsburry Estate and The Watton Hill Trust</i>
<i>Portland Harbour Authority</i>	<i>Trustees of the BTD Pension Scheme</i>
<i>Portland Town Council</i>	
<i>Public Health Dorset</i>	
<i>Sherborne Town Council</i>	
<i>South Somerset District Council</i>	
<i>Sport England</i>	

Support

- Support questions 4-i to 4-vi and 4-viii to 4-xii. (Sherborne Town Council)
- Support questions 4-i to 4-xii. (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy)
- Support policies ECON1, 2, 3, 13 & 14. (Sport England)
- Welcome reference to the natural environment as a contributor to the economy in paragraph 4.1.3. (Dorset Local Nature Partnership, Dorset Wildlife Trust)

General Comments

- The Review is part reliant on the promises produced by the Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), which are considered to be simplistic and do not take account of the current status of the Dorset economy.
- The very different nature of the economic and housing requirements of Weymouth & Portland from those of West Dorset should be clearly recognised by the economic vision for the new authority.
- There needs to be a balance between housing and employment. The type of housing provision should be suitable for the needs of the population in each

particular area and employment of a skilled nature should be provided for the working population.

- Considerations of the economy of the Weymouth & Portland area should be widened to include the need for improvement of the infrastructure, in particular the Western Relief Road.
- We were disappointed that the Jurassic Coast Highway / Western Relief Road was not included. (Portland Harbour Authority)

Definition of Employment

- The statement in paragraph 4.1.6 that sport makes a huge contribution to the lives of individuals, to the economy and to society is welcomed. We have undertaken research to examine the economic value of sport in England and definition of employment. (Sport England)
- The Plan should consider D2 sports uses (i.e. fitness clubs, gyms, climbing centres and five-a-side centres) to be acceptable on employment sites or in town centres as they create sustainable employment opportunities and provide work experience and qualifications in cases for the less academically inclined. (Sport England)

Strategic Approach to the Economy

- The Strategic Approach (Paragraph 4.1.7) should be focussed on encouraging and aiding existing local businesses. Enough brownfield sites are available to support the organic expansion of existing firms around South Street, Bridport but the Council is intent on selling these off to private developers.
- The Strategic Approach is out of date when it comes to retail and town centre uses, as there is a lack of awareness of retail trends in the last twenty years. Department stores should be built on council-owned car parks in Dorchester and Bridport.
- Paragraph 4.1.7 states 'a continuing supply of land and premises suitable for employment uses is needed' without offering any evidence. There is very low unemployment, the average age of the population is increasing and the employment available is generally not highly paid. Encouraging major outside business interests to relocate to West Dorset could be counter-productive because of the highly restrictive transportation infrastructure. To bring a workforce with such firms would worsen the traffic problems, exacerbate the pressure on housing and local services, and harm protected landscapes and the wider environment.

Responses on Question 4-i: Policy ECON₁ has been revised to more clearly set out the approach to employment development in rural areas. Do you have any views on this, or any other changes, to Policy ECON₁?

ECON₁ Criterion i): Employment Development

- There appears to be no limitation to the scale of development outside DDBs but on the edge of settlements. This undermines the legitimacy of DDBs.
- More needs to be done to encourage new employment as well as intensification and extension. Government policy to stimulate the economy is totally ignored. (Hanford Holdings Limited)
- The policy should include reference to those areas covered under Policy ECON₂ which may not have a DDB surrounding them. (Portland Town Council)

ECON₁ Criterion ii): Employment Development in Rural Areas

- This policy does not 'recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements'. (Hanford Holdings Limited).
- The policy is negative and fails to deliver the support for the rural economy required by the NPPF. This policy fails to make provision for 'all types of business' and does not make provision for 'well-designed new buildings'. (Hanford Holdings Limited)
- The restraint on small scale employment opportunities in rural areas (particularly smaller settlements that do not have a DDB) appears to be too inflexible. (Dorset Planning Consultant Limited)

Paragraph 4.2.5: Live Work Schemes

- Support live-work units in new residential development. The design of housing should take that potential into account, with personal workspace built-in and the potential to expand the premises where necessary.
- Different issues are raised by the idea that homes might be large enough to accommodate small enterprises with multiple employees. This would reduce the number of homes per hectare, and raise difficult issues of traffic, vehicle parking and disturbance in the design of residential areas.

Automation

- The automation technologies will have a dramatic impact on reducing employment, the types of jobs available and the skills required, resulting in a probable reduction in in-migration and increase in outward migration. (Moreton Parish Council)

Portland Port

- Support the retention of the DDB for the Portland Port ECON₂ sites. (Portland Port Group, Portland Harbour Authority)

Responses on Question 4-ii: The list of key employment sites in Figure 4.1 has been revised to include new employment land allocations: north of Dorchester; south of Broadwindsor Road, Beaminster; and west of Sherborne. The approach to employment and other uses on key employment sites has also been updated. Do you have any comments on these, or any other changes to Policy ECON₂?

Allowing Alternative Uses on Key Employment Sites

- The current wording of ECON₂ is too rigid. (Trustees of the BTD Pension Scheme)
- ECON₂ should be amended to allow support for alternative uses in appropriate circumstances. Policy ECON₂ is not sufficiently flexible to allow a policy compliant mixed use planning application to come forward. (AAV Plastics)
- Key employment sites should be available for mixed use and even residential development.
- Given the length of the plan, it is good planning to allow for greater flexibility for alternative uses to be delivered on employment sites where it can be demonstrated that there is no need for the employment land. Policy ECON₂ iv) should be deleted. (Persimmon Homes)

Viability on Key Employment Sites

- Market demand or the employment uses cannot be viably delivered within the plan.

Allowing Trade Counters on Key Employment Sites

- Remove the word 'exceptionally' from ECON2 iii). (Bridport Town Council)

Waste Facilities on Key Employment Sites

- 'Waste uses' are appropriate on employment land, as set out in the National Planning Policy for Waste (2014). (Dorset County Council: Minerals & Waste)
- Existing waste management facilities meeting certain criteria and allocated waste sites are safeguarded by Policy 24 of the emerging Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Waste Plan. (Dorset County Council: Minerals & Waste)
- Policy ECON2 ii) should be amended to enable identified needs for waste management infrastructure to be located on key employment sites. (Dorset County Council: Minerals & Waste)

Need for Review of Key Employment Sites

- Named 'key employment sites' should be reviewed to ensure that those carried forward remain fit for purpose and consistent with the NPPF, which seeks to avoid the long term protection of employment sites. It appears that there has not been any review. (Trustees of the BTD Pension Scheme)
- Many of the key employment sites in the plan are old employment sites that have been in existence for many years to standards which are well out of date. Many are congested with inadequate parking and servicing for modern vehicles. (Hanford Holdings Limited)

Key Employment Sites: Beaminster

- Land at Lane End Farm should be removed from the list of 'Key Employment Sites' or at least the southern parcels of the BEAM2 allocation should be deleted, in order to facilitate a mixed use proposal. 'Pump priming' or 'cross subsidisation' is required to ensure deliverability for the site. (AAV Plastics)

Key Employment Sites: Bridport

- The site at Crepe Farm in Bridport should be deleted. The site is a working farm which provides holiday accommodation. Any existing employment uses are temporary until the buildings are required to support the main uses. The site is not available for open market employment development unrelated to the main estate activities and is unsuitable to accommodate large commercial vehicles. (Symonds Estate and The Watton Hill Trust)
- The policy should include St Michael's Trading Estate as a key employment site. (Bridport Town Council)
- Key employment status should be relinquished from the site at Pymore Mills as it is significantly under-utilised and possesses a number of constraints that makes it unattractive to the commercial market. If key employment status is not relinquished across the whole site, the designation should be removed from the southern

section, where substantially under occupied buildings with redevelopment potential exist. (Trustees of the BTB Pension Scheme)

Key Employment Sites: Crossways

- It should be noted that there are waste facilities on some key employment sites including Hybris Business Park. (Dorset County Council: Minerals & Waste)
- Uncertain how a formerly 'ring-fenced' ECON2 site (CRS3) can become an ECON3 site even though the new ECON2 site (CRS2) is smaller and less accessible. Suggest ECON2 and ECON3 explain the principles involved. (Moreton Parish Council)

Key Employment Sites: Dorchester

- It should be noted that there are existing waste facilities on some key employment sites including Loudsmill. (Dorset County Council: Minerals & Waste)
- There is also a site allocated in the Waste Plan for a new household recycling centre on the land east of Loudsmill (inset 5 of the Waste Plan). (Dorset County Council: Minerals & Waste)
- There is an aspiration for a household recycling centre at North Dorchester, referred to in the main modifications to the emerging Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Waste Plan. (Dorset County Council: Minerals & Waste)

Key Employment Sites: Piddlehinton

- Bourne Park / Enterprise Park should be added to Table 3.6. (Hanford Holdings Limited)

Key Employment Sites: Portland

- DDBs should be retained around the Portland Port key employment sites. Other operational land with planning consents within Portland Port should also be included as key employment sites. (Portland Harbour Authority, Portland Port Group)
- We need to support existing key employment facilities: for example, Portland Port and also Jurassica / Memo. Improvements to the road links to Portland are essential to sustain and develop jobs on the island.
- We have included an additional key employment site in our neighbourhood plan and removed the DDB around some of the isolated sites. (Portland Town Council)

Key Employment Sites: Sherborne

- ECON 2 is missing several key employment sites in Sherborne – the glass factory, Bradfords, Gas Hill and Westbury Yarn. Vacant town centres sites could also be included, such as the Police Station and Magistrates Court.
- The Bradford's site in Sherborne, as vacated, would be better used, due to its location, for housing than employment.

Responses on Question 4-iii: The approach to employment and other uses on other (non-key) employment sites has been updated. Do you have any comments on these, or any other changes to Policy ECON3?

Non-key Employment Sites

- We welcome the approach set out in policy ECON₃; however this approach should be extended to sites covered by ECON₂. (Persimmon Homes)
- We have included a set time frame within our own policies as this puts a more visible notice on intentions. Accept criteria shown. (Portland Town Council)
- Should this apply to retail? E.g. closure of a shop (Dorchester Town Council)
- It is suggested that reference is made to waste management facilities in paragraph 4.3.7 and Policy ECON₃. The policy should enable an identified need for waste management infrastructure to be met on non-key employment sites. (Dorset County Council: Minerals & Waste)

Responses on Question 4-iv: The need for additional retail development has been re-assessed in a new town centres and retail study. Do you have any comments on the reassessed need for retail development, as set out in new Policy ECON₄?

Support

- Retail growth in Dorchester, which will benefit the hospital's staff, patients and visitors, is supported. (Dorset County Hospital)

Forecasts of Future Retail Need

- We cannot see the need in West Dorset for this volume of retail space.
- We question the ECON₄ analysis and forecast and would like more detail and clarification on the methodology, particularly as it appears to totally ignore the effect of online purchasing over the next 20 years.
- To base a 20-year forecast on the assumption of steady growth in new physical retail floorspace seems perverse as we see an increasing trend for retail outlets closing / reducing in size.
- The Review needs to be specific as to the exact forecasts used, why they were used, what alternative forecasts exist and if these concur with the forecast used.
- The proposed growth in food and non-food floorspace in question 4-iv seems very unrealistic. (Moreton Parish Council)
- The document is based upon an increasing need for retail space, but it is widely accepted that the retail sector is experiencing serious problems. Some of these problems are due to market changes (e.g. on-line shopping) that are not cyclical.
- We do not need any additional retail space and should, instead, be looking to free up some retail sites for residential use, especially around the edges of town centres.

ECON₄: Bridport

- Concerned that the assessment used is already out-of-date, may be inaccurate, and that the figure for non-food (comparison) floor space in Bridport may be over-optimistic and inappropriate for the town. (Bridport Town Council)
- Plans for major retail development (e.g. department stores) on council car parks in Bridport, at a time when department stores are closing in large numbers nationwide, shows how out of touch it is in terms of retail trends.

ECON₄: Dorchester

- Plans for major retail development (e.g. department stores) on council car parks in Dorchester, at a time when department stores are closing in large numbers nationwide, shows how out of touch it is in terms of retail trends.
- Suitable allocated sites should be included in the plan to meet the need. However, DCHFT does not consider the allocated sites to be deliverable. Issues of town centre car parking needs to be resolved before any of the sites can be considered deliverable. (Dorset County Hospital)
- DCHFT is concerned that the loss of any off-street parking in Dorchester will have significant impacts on the demand for parking at the hospital. (Dorset County Hospital)
- We can only provide, not develop. (Dorchester Town Council)

ECON₄: Portland

- There has been some concern as to the basis for the physical assessment of local centres. We have defined within our neighbourhood plan areas which fulfil a local / neighbourhood need allowing for the changing pattern of high street social engagement and growth activity areas. (Portland Town Council)

ECON₄: Sherborne

- In old town centres, such as Sherborne, developers extend old shops into the rear areas because at the cost of using steel beams the first floor can be supported and open plan space results. Consultants have not taken this factor into account.

ECON₄: Weymouth

- This has a serious impact on decisions such as the future of the Jubilee Sidings in Weymouth, which could be released for residential use.

Responses on Question 4-v: Part of former Policy ECON₄ (now ECON₅) establishes an approach to the location of town centres uses by requiring a 'sequential test' to be applied and impact assessments to be produced in certain circumstances. A hierarchy of centres has also been defined in the supporting text (Table 4.2). Do you have any comments on new Policy ECON₅ or the supporting text?

ECON₅: Support

- Agree with Policy ECON₅ and the supporting text. (Bridport Town Council)
- While I disagree with the policy of more development, ECON₅ is needed to detract from out-of-town developments being permitted.

ECON₅ Criterion i): Network and Hierarchy of Centres

- Symondsburry should be identified as a local centre in West Dorset. The village provides a range of 11 retail and related units which provide a number of important local services. In addition, the village centre houses a community centre and a number of employment-related uses suitable for a small local centre. (Symondsburry Estate and The Watton Hill Trust)

ECON5 Criteria iii) and iv): Sequential Approach

- It is welcomed that the application of the sequential test is applied pragmatically and the inclusion of appropriate circumstances where the test will not be necessary. Circumstances where proposals seek to extend or provide additional facilities at existing tourism accommodation sites are capable of providing location specific criteria. (Luxury Family Hotels)
- The expectation set out in paragraph 4.4.19 that when applying the sequential test, applicants should take account of the wider catchment area including centres outside of the plan review area, such as Yeovil, is supported. It is suggested that paragraph 4.4.19 could be further strengthened by making specific reference to proposals at the Peel Centre. (South Somerset District Council)
- The recognition in ECON5 that the sequential test will not be applied to proposals relating to rural tourism is supported. It is essential that this exemption is retained to enable hotels and resorts to operate effectively. Flexibility in applying the sequential test is an essential component of this. (Luxury Family Hotels)

ECON5 Criterion vi): Retail Impact Assessment

- It is not clear how the locally set threshold (of 300 square metres) has been justified. Object to ECON5 until clarification has been provided. (Dorset County Hospital)
- Policy ECON5 criteria vi) should be amended from 'may' to 'will' in order to give clarity and certainty that the impact test will be required. It is ambiguous as currently written. (South Somerset District Council)
- The policy should be re-visited to ensure that it complies with the NPPF, particularly criteria vii), as this does not mention the impact on planned investment in the centre or catchment area. (South Somerset District Council)
- Assessments should take account of the accessibility for year-round residents rather than prioritise seasonal activity. (Portland Town Council)

Responses on Question 4-vi: Part of former Policy ECON4 (now ECON6) sets out an updated approach to the protection of retail frontages. Do you have any comments on this approach, as set out in new Policy ECON6?

ECON6: Support

- Happy to hear encouragement for better use of space above shops.

ECON6: Objections

- Criterion ii) should be amended to ensure that in secondary shopping areas the level of non-retail uses does not exceed 25% of the total number of shops, in order to ensure the protection of the retail frontages and avoid the concentration of non-retail uses in one particular area. (Symondsby Estate and The Watton Hill Trust)
- Those who provide retail or service provision largely through the internet should be encouraged to maintain a shop front presentation to preserve the sense of vibrancy. Policy intentions as set out in 4.4.33 should also be factored in as opportunity use. (Portland Town Council)
- Flexibility is needed so that redundant retail premises can be used for dwellings just as many were when first built.

- For conservation area premises we support their conversion back to what they were originally (i.e. residences).
- A requirement to adhere to relevant neighbourhood plan policies should be included in new Policy ECON6. (Bridport Town Council)

Sherborne

- In Sherborne, premises are neither primary nor secondary retail. They are simply retail and the hierarchy is inappropriate.
- Former town centre houses (mainly handsome Georgian and Victorian buildings) should be restored to their former glory. So we disagree with ECON6 ii).

Weymouth

- Would like to see far more independent, quirky, one-off retailers, especially in Weymouth, rather than just endless chain stores. Would love to see Weymouth become a funkier, interesting, arty, foody, shopping destination.

Responses on Question 4-vii: A new policy is being proposed to restrict hot food takeaways within easy walking distance of schools and other areas where children congregate. Do you have any views on new Policy ECON7?

ECON7: Support

- Support Policy ECON7. (Bridport Town Council)
- We support the introduction of this policy. Access to healthier food outlets is associated with increased weight across the population and increased obesity and unhealthy eating behaviour among children. Child obesity rates in Weymouth & Portland are of concern and, as part of a comprehensive approach to creating healthy environments, limiting provision of hot food takeaways close to places where children congregate can help to encourage healthier eating choices. (Public Health Dorset)

ECON7: Objections

- This policy should be restricted to mobile catering units. (Sherborne Town Council)
- Where a fast food takeaway provider can evidence a healthy menu then this should be considered within policy intentions. (Portland Town Council)
- The definition of 'where children congregate' in the policy is loose. (McDonald's Restaurants Ltd UK)
- There is no evidence to suggest any causal link between the presence of A5 uses within 400m of schools and increases in obesity or poor health. In fact, studies that have considered whether such a causal connection exists, have found none. (McDonald's Restaurants Ltd UK)
- The policy aims to address obesity and unhealthy eating but instead simply restricts new development that comprises an element of A5 use. Yet A1 retail outlets and A3 food and drink uses can also sell food that is high in calories, fat, salt and sugar. (McDonald's Restaurants Ltd UK)
- Research shows only 8% of all journeys to and from school included purchasing visits to a food outlet. (McDonald's Restaurants Ltd UK)

- National policy contains no support for a policy approach containing a blanket ban or exclusion zone for A5 uses. If introduced, the policy would have severe land use consequences whilst possibly creating an uneven distribution of locations where hot food takeaways could be permitted. (McDonald's Restaurants Ltd UK)
- Examination of other plans has found similar policy approaches to be unsound. (McDonald's Restaurants Ltd UK)
- A range of criteria should be taken into account, including not just proximity to schools but also wider impacts. A blanket exclusion zone is not supported. Setting criteria and requiring a health impact assessment would be better. (McDonald's Restaurants Ltd UK)
- We would welcome and support proposals for a wider study of the causes of obesity and their relationship with development proposals, including an examination of how new development can best support healthy lifestyles and the tackling of obesity. When a cogent evidence base has been assembled, this can then inform an appropriate policy response.

Responses on Question 4-viii: A new policy has been introduced to protect markets. Do you have any views on new Policy ECON8?

ECON8: Support

- Support Policy ECON8. (Bridport Town Council, Portland Town Council)
- Markets are a valuable resource and should be protected so I support ECON8.

ECON8: Objections

- There is a strong element of hanging onto the past in ECON8. The advent of markets online, the reduction in the price of many goods online and the widespread adoption of car boot sales has significantly supplanted the demand for the traditional market. (Moreton Parish Council)
- It would be wrong to put markets in primary shopping areas. They could be located nearby within easy reach but to put them in a primary shopping area will degrade the shopping area. (Moreton Parish Council)
- The policy as written is supported. However, in doing so it is considered that the current proposals being put forward by WDDC will not be compliant with the policy or with NPPF paragraph 85 part c. (Dorset County Hospital)

Responses on Question 4-ix: Former Policies ECON5 and 6 (now ECON9 and 10) now set out the circumstances when the 'sequential test' for town centre uses will be applied to tourist attractions and accommodation developments. Do you have any views on this, or any other changes to new Policies ECON9 and 10?

General Comments

- Tourism accommodation and facilities are location specific and operate as a single entity. Specific reference should be made to the support for existing businesses, including tourism accommodation, in rural areas including when it may be appropriate to deliver new buildings through replacement or infilling on existing sites. (Luxury Family Hotels)

- The analysis fails to take account of market changes. There has been a massive growth in rental within private homes (e.g. Airbnb) which has been omitted.
- The provision of parking etc. on any new build is vital and must be enforced.
- The coast and countryside are attractions in their own right.
- The section on tourism does not make any mention of protecting existing landscapes, AONB etc., so that its attractiveness to tourists is not diminished. The AONB is a huge attraction and degrading this attraction will damage the local economy and any hope of national park status.
- We need to ensure that Portland's potentially unique circumstances in regard to tourism development are accurately reflected within the framework on this policy direction. (Portland Town Council)

ECON₉: Support

- Support the town-centre first approach. Would also like to see fewer grotty guesthouses and more upmarket establishments.

ECON₉: Objections

- There is a real danger that excessive tourism will end up destroying the qualities that attract holiday-makers in the first place.
- We are concerned that ECON₉ may not be workable for all types of attraction, and may not be appropriate for smaller market towns. (Bridport Town Council)
- We ask for more emphasis on ECON₉ i). There is a parking problem in Sherborne and we suspect that the provision of any new tourist facility may not have space for the facilities outlined in 4.5.7. We would welcome improvement here in access, parking and toilet facilities.
- The term 'adequate visitor facilities' in criterion i) needs clarification. (Dorchester Town Council)

ECON₁₀: Support

- The flexibility afforded by the provisions of ECON₁₀ is supported. This is essential to affording existing tourism accommodation businesses the flexibility to modernise and adjust to changes in the tourism market in order to maintain a sustainable business model. (Luxury Family Hotels)
- It is recognised that tourism accommodation may be permitted in a location where open market housing would normally be refused. (Luxury Family Hotels)

ECON₁₀: Objections

- It is necessary for businesses to adopt a flexible approach to the form of tourist accommodation provided, in the light of the changing nature of the tourism market and the necessity to reflect market demand. (Luxury Family Hotels)
- The criteria in ECON₁₀ ii) relating to built tourist accommodation are too specific. They should be based on the location, the form of the accommodation and not restricted to specific locations. (Symonds Estate and The Watton Hill Trust)
- It seems to us that ECON₁₀ ii) gives blanket support to new rural tourist accommodation (in established settlements of over 200 people). We would have expected to see something about size, design, infrastructure etc.

Occupancy Restrictions

- It is understandable that the Council will look to use occupancy restrictions. Occupancy restrictions will trigger the payment of VAT on new build accommodation and significantly impact on scheme viability. It is therefore essential that such provisions are as flexible as possible and also excluded from other development levies, such as CIL. (Luxury Family Hotels)

Moonfleet Hotel

- Moonfleet Hotel is located in a unique position with views over The Fleet. However, it is now in need of significant investment. Existing built tourism infrastructure and space requires a flexible planning policy to enable continued investment so that the hotel remains a high quality tourist asset. (Luxury Family Hotels)

Responses on Question 4-x: Former Policy ECON7 (now ECON11) and supporting text have been amended to give greater clarity in relation to the expansion, intensification and reorganisation of existing caravan and camping sites and to set out how proposals for caravan and camping sites as part of farm diversification schemes will be considered. Do you have any views on these, or any other changes, to new Policy ECON11?

ECON11: Caravan and Camping Sites

- Policy ECON11 ii) is too restrictive. Tourist-related caravan / camping provision is supported in its own right by the policy, because of the significant contribution it makes to the economy. The provision of such sites, which assist farm diversification, could be justified in the same way. (Symondsby Estate and The Watton Hill Trust)
- The term 'Heritage Coast' as referred to in new Policy ECON11 and the supporting text must be clearly defined in order to (i) enable meaningful comment on this policy, and (ii) provide for objective interpretation / enforcement. How far inland will this area stretch? (Bridport Town Council)
- Portland is increasingly attracting overnight staying motorhomes and so a management policy which directs provision and provides an economic benefit to the community will need to be considered. The policy may have to include reference to diversification in other land owning industries. (Portland Town Council)

Responses on Question 4-xi: Former Policies ECON8 and 9 (now ECON12 and 13) and supporting text have been amended to give greater clarity about when new agricultural buildings and diversification projects will be permitted. Do you have any views on these, or any other changes, to Policies ECON12 and 13?

ECON12: New Agricultural Buildings

- ECON12 ii), relating to scale, siting and design, must be enforced.

ECON13: Diversification of Land-based Rural Businesses

- Real care is needed here to ensure that we don't get spurious diversification and that the diversification doesn't affect local residents adversely.

- The constrained nature of Portland’s environment could make this a sensitive issue.
(Portland Town Council)

Responses on Question 4-xii: Former Policy ECON₁₀ (now ECON₁₄) and supporting text has been expanded to provide guidance on how proposals for different types of equestrian-related development will be considered. Do you have any views on these, or any other changes, to new Policy ECON₁₄?

ECON₁₄: Equestrian-related Development

- No comments.