

# East Dorset Local Plan Review

## Summary of responses to the 2018 Options Consultation

March 2021



*The Preferred Options consultation document for the East Dorset Local Plan Review Preferred Options Consultation was produced by East Dorset District Council. On 1st April 2019, East Dorset District Council ceased to exist and the new Dorset Council came into being.*

*For the avoidance of doubt, this document summarises the comments made by organisations and individuals in response to the Options consultation document for the East Dorset Local Plan Review of 2018. The summarised comments do not represent the views of members or officers of Dorset Council.*

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction .....	5
1.1	Introduction: .....	5
1.2	What is the local plan review:.....	5
1.3	Delivery of the local plan: .....	5
1.4	Transport:.....	5
1.5	Sustainability Appraisal and HRA: .....	5
2.	A Picture of East Dorset .....	6
2.1	Comments on surrounding maps: .....	6
2.2	Transport and accessibility: .....	6
2.3	Employment:.....	6
2.4	Tourism: .....	6
2.5	Communities – People .....	6
2.6	Minerals and waste.....	6
2.7	Water .....	6
2.8	Health:.....	6
3.	Strategic Policy.....	7
3.1	Challenges, vision and strategic objectives.....	7
3.2	The Key Strategy .....	8
4.	Core Policies & Development Management.....	14
4.1	Environment.....	14
4.2	Green Belt .....	19
4.3	Housing .....	20
4.4	Heritage & Conservation.....	23
4.5	Landscape, Design & Open Spaces .....	23
4.6	Economic Growth.....	25
4.7	Bournemouth Airport .....	26
5.	Site Allocations and Area Based Policies.....	27
	Introduction .....	27
5.1	Wimborne, Colehill & Corfe Mullen.....	27
5.2	Ferndown, West Parley and Longham .....	33
5.3	Verwood, St Leonards, St Ives & West Moors .....	39
5.4	Rural settlements in East Dorset.....	43

6.	Appendices.....	63
6.1	A - Affordable Housing Definitions .....	63
6.2	B - Guidelines for the Establishment of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs) .....	63
6.3	C - Glossary.....	63

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Introduction:

- Concerns of implications on neighbouring parishes if infrastructure is not provided in the areas to be developed (**Verwood Town Council**)
- Need to consider issues of air quality relating to European and internationally designated sites (**Natural England**)
- General objections to development and questions about the legality of development without the necessary infrastructure.

## 1.2 What is the local plan review:

- Query regarding whether Dorset Council will support Town and Parish Councils wishing to develop a Neighbourhood Plan (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)

## 1.3 Delivery of the local plan:

- Concerns surrounding delivery, funding and priority of infrastructure and transport projects (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Concerns over key points within the local plan including roads and congestion which has not been addressed, solar panels should be on all new houses, requirement to plan for water including reservoirs and water treatment, requirement to state where new schools will be and where capacity will be increased at them, improvements to public transport needed, more doctors surgeries needed, waste disposal plans need addressing, improvements in infrastructure needed for Ferndown Industrial Estate traffic
- The plan would not be found sound as it is not deliverable and Duty to Cooperate not fulfilled

## 1.4 Transport:

- Objection to any more development until the road network is improved

## 1.5 Sustainability Appraisal and HRA:

- Should consider air quality relating to European and internationally designated sites (**Natural England**)
- Factual error - assessment of Dudsbury Golf Course – it is not agricultural land
- The screening matrix highlights a number of areas where the likely significant effect of draft policies on European sites is uncertain, triggering the requirement for more detailed assessment. The HRA recommends further assessment is required to determine the importance of off-site habitat functionally linked to European sites which may be of importance to qualifying species. This is key given the proximity of many of the greenfield options to protected sites.
- Para 1.0.19 - further assessment should be done on European sites within the HRA to understand impacts of development
- further assessment of European sites required at part 1.0.19 to understand impacts of development
- further comments surrounding the plan not being sound and Duty to Cooperate not fulfilled

## 2. A Picture of East Dorset

This section sets the scene for the area by going into the area's characteristics. It therefore sets out the key attributes that are important to consider when establishing a vision, objectives, policies and proposals. This section includes no policies and therefore comments were related to specific points within the chapter.

### 2.1 Comments on surrounding maps:

- Map 2.0.1 HMA map should be amended to show the housing market extending into the new forest. The Bournemouth/South East Dorset Housing Market Area does extend into the New Forest however the map indicates the Housing Market Area being cut exactly to the administrative boundary of the District, rather than extending into Hampshire. **(Policy Manager New Forest National Park Authority)**
- Maps should be enlarged on the page **(Wimborne Town Council)**

### 2.2 Transport and accessibility:

- Concerns over high reliance on cars and high levels of car ownership in the district **(Strategic Planning Manager Hampshire County Council)**
- Would be useful to have relative uses of various types of transport so comparisons can be made rather than just vehicular travel. **(Transport Planning Bournemouth Borough Council)**

### 2.3 Employment:

- D2 sports uses should be considered acceptable uses on employment parks. **(Sports England)**
- Support for sports provision to be part of working environments. **(Sports England)**

### 2.4 Tourism:

- Tourism is of high importance to the area however funding has been withdrawn and this is of large concern. **(Wimborne Town Council)**

### 2.5 Communities – People

- Population projections - queries fewer families with children but more families in 2.0.14 - therefore net increase?

### 2.6 Minerals and waste

- By the time the plan is adopted there will only be one Minerals and Waste authority tier

### 2.7 Water

- no mention of the Stour under 'water', which floods regularly

### 2.8 Health:

- There are a number of references throughout the settlements / policies requiring development to provide for health facilities. This is good but are they the right ones and are there more?

## 3. Strategic Policy

### 3.1 Challenges, vision and strategic objectives

#### Challenges

- support for challenges identified

#### Vision

- should mention other policy drivers in climate change section and input info regarding reducing air pollution **(Natural England)**
- support for transport improvements and A31 improvements from Ferndown to Merley **(Hampshire County Council Strategic Planning)**
- reference to improvements to A31 from Ferndown to Merley should reference Canford Bottom roundabout **(Wimborne Town Council)**
- supportive of vision and of focusing new development along transport corridors **(Transport Planning Bournemouth Borough Council)**
- vision - AONB national designation so should be given as much prominence as greenbelt **(Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- welcomes reference to AONBs in vision **(Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- document feels rushed and there are many anomalies **(Sturminster Marshall Parish Council)**
- "The NPPF also notes that Local Plans are the key to delivering development that reflects the vision and aspiration of local communities." - this should truly be considered as it is important to preserve village life
- must have more plans for infrastructure including roads, sewage and water utilities, schools, public transport, health services, retail outlets etc as much of it is at breaking point
- CIL - overarching CIL/S106 catch all policy needed
- support for recognition of importance of natural environment
- should include reference to conservation and enhancement of the historic environment

#### Objectives

##### *General:*

- health and wellbeing is not explicitly mentioned in the objectives and should be

##### *Objective 1:*

- biodiversity gain should be present within all developments and not just major developments
- other protected habitats including wetlands and Stour Valley nature reserve should be explicitly referenced **(Natural England)**

##### *Objective 2:*

- support for heritage and open space elements **(Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**

##### *Objective 3:*

- support **(Hampshire County Council Strategic Planning)**
- development should insist on and not just encourage low carbon measures. Solar panels should be standard on all new homes

#### Objective 4:

- should include links to strengthening ecological networks

#### Objective 5:

- support for objective 5

#### Objective 6:

- support **(Natural England)**
- support in principle however should mention public transport improvements and model future bus provision. Support for improvements to prime corridors. Support for policy 3.10.
- support for improvements to prime transport corridors, reducing the need for people to travel, and improvement of A31 around Wimborne. None of these improvements mitigate proposed Alderholt development. **(Hampshire County Council Strategic Planning)**
- proposed amendments to objective 6 to reference public transport improvements.

### 3.2 The Key Strategy

62 comments were received in relation to the spatial strategy. The points from each have been subdivided and grouped into different sections for analysis.

#### Introduction

- The introduction should explicitly mention health and wellbeing
- In relation to the key strategy giving improvement to transport networks for all users, a comment stated that development should be in accessible areas, and an objection to 1000 dwellings at Alderholt was given
- General objection to development as the 'whole area' is being spoilt by overdevelopment.

#### Draft Policy 3.1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

- There is no reference in this section to the process of consultation with key parties to ensure a transparent and fair process for all involved and affected by any forthcoming applications. The Town Council would request that consideration is given to the inclusion of such a statement. **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- Support for policy 3.1 which would comply with the spatial strategy if amended as suggested due to too much reliance on rural service centres and failure to give sufficient weight to 'the need to promote sustainable patterns of development' when proposing to remove Green Belt land. The plan promotes a significant amount of development in isolated and unsustainable locations and is not in line with national policy.

#### Draft Policy 3.2 Settlement Hierarchy

- There is a requirement for greater clarification around the definition of 'infill development' which could be included in policy 3.2
- Support for policy 3.2, should focus housing along existing transport corridors to allow networks to grow
- The plan fails to decide whether allocated sites are deliverable and are not delivered in the most sustainable locations
- Development is required in accessible areas to reduce travel need and mitigate climate change
- Concerns over the soundness of the spatial strategy in terms of sustainability
- Support for inclusion of Corfe Mullen as a Main Settlement in the hierarchy



### Draft Policy 3.3 Green Belt

- Objection to amendments to green belt boundaries on environmental grounds and because current infrastructure cannot deal with current needs

### Comments of support for policies and further comments included:

- Recommendation that 'wildlife strategy' within the policy should be altered to 'biodiversity strategy'. **(Manager Dorset Local Nature Partnership)**
- Various comments giving appreciation for need to alter Green Belt boundaries to alter housing need
- Need to release Green Belt land near to main settlements for sustainability reasons. Rewording of policy to reflect this
- Support for inclusion of wildlife strategy in policy

### Objections and further comments included:

- Objection to Green Belt development to meet the need of neighbouring authorities **(Dorset CPRE)**
- The CPRE can never approve of building in the Green Belt but we do appreciate the lack of Brown Field sites in the East Dorset District and Government imposed housing numbers. However, as above, footnote 6 on Page 6 may provide a get out clause at some point. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Concerns over soundness of Green Belt strategy
- land at QE School and Wimborne Model Town should not be excluded from green belt as puts them at risk from housing development **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- general objection to development strategy and Green Belt development but support for affordable housing
- Objections to wording of policy 3.3 apart from infilling in villages. Policy should 3.2 include definition of infill development

### Comments surrounding further clarification and recommendations:

- Section should cross reference Section 5 maps **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- Clarification needed over why development is being allowed in settlements that lie both within the Green Belt and AONB namely Edmondsham and Hinton Martell - suggestion that either those two villages are removed from the list or that a clear and understandable case is made for permitting development in those villages that are both within the AONB and the Green Belt. **(Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Should include criterion to improve access to greenbelt for recreation to support health and wellbeing
- Comment relating to purposes of the greenbelt and how openness and permanence should be given more weight in greenbelt assessment. Comment relating to weaknesses in the greenbelt methodology
- Policy should include criterion to improve access to greenbelt for recreation to support health and wellbeing
- Need to consider sustainable patterns of development when allocating sites

### Promotion and considerations of other sites:

- Queries proposed greenbelt sites at Wimborne and states that the site at Stone Park would be a better alternative without encroaching the countryside. Notes other development would result in greenbelt encroachment and lack of reasoning to support this.
- Land east and west of Haywards Lane, Corfe Mullen for release from Green Belt
- Recommend allocation of land west of Brockwood and Oaks Drive in St Leonards to meeting housing needs

### Draft Policy 3.4 Housing Provision in East Dorset

#### Main Themes

##### *Spatial strategy:*

- Many comments related to the spatial strategy being unsound
- When considered against paragraph 35 of the NPPF it is not justified, effective or consistent with national policy
- Allocation of 1000 dwellings in Alderholt is not a sustainable location, this is the same as allocations in the main settlements and houses should be allocated in more sustainable locations and not at rural service centres
- Objection to policy 3.4 as the spatial strategy does not make sense

##### *Standard methodology/housing numbers:*

- there is insufficient information regarding how the residential requirement is derived
- support for standardised methodology used for housing requirement and OAHN
- standard methodology and housing numbers need to be updated in the plan. The housing target in policy 3.4 should be expressed as a minimum instead of 'about'

##### *The Duty to Cooperate has not been met:*

- plan does not fulfil duty to cooperate requirements or take account of Christchurch and other local authorities unmet need
- Council should proactively consider neighbouring councils' needs.

##### *Green Belt:*

- The Green Belt Assessment was not suitably evidenced based
- Support for building in various locations beyond the green belt whilst enhancing key service centres

##### *Infrastructure:*

- there are no plans for improvements to and new services, facilities and utilities to tie in with this
- existing infrastructure can't cope with more development

##### *Alderholt concerns:*

- Concerns over level of growth at Alderholt as current services cannot support this and would be difficult to complete dwellings and community infrastructure within the 15 year timeframe given
- Location is not sustainable

##### *Sites:*

- Lack of contingency in allocated sites, requirement for 20% buffer

- Lack of flexibility for if sites do not come forward- requirement for sites for early part of plan period.

#### Additional comments:

- Query whether housing would be reserved for locals as second home ownership is a concern.
- Support for possibility of new town in East Dorset area (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Explanation required of why affordability figure is set at 35% (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Wimborne- concerns about congestion, traffic and pollution (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Objection to removal of special character area status (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Support for improvement of energy standards with new development and for rights of way being retained in development (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- The Plan will not meet the development needs of the area or be flexible to adopt to change and reflect the aspirations of the local community
- Request for contributions towards NHS primary care infrastructure from CIL or Section 106 from development
- Affordable housing - housing is expensive and not affordable, explanation and supervision of requirement is necessary
- Support for policy 3.4
- Suggestion that the land at Hampreston be used to build a school
- Spetisbury- Would like plans to include the protection of trailways, cycling paths and old railway lines to encourage walking tourists and the option for people to walk and not take the car

#### Draft Policy 3.5 Strategic Green Infrastructure and Heathland Mitigation

- No specific comments received

#### Draft Policy 3.6 Provision of Employment Land

- Support for policy 3.6 (**Sport England**)

#### Draft Policy 3.7 Future Retail Provision

- Request for statistics surrounding affordability of retail space as evidence has suggested to the Town Council that affordability of current available retail space might also be a problem (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)

#### Draft Policy 3.8 Town Centre Hierarchy

- No specific comments received

#### Draft Policy 3.9 Role of Town and District Centres

- Support for including D2 sports uses on primary shopping areas (**Sport England**)

#### Draft Policy 3.10 Transport Strategy and Prime Transport Corridors

- support for policies 3.10, 3.11 and 3.12

#### *Duty to Cooperate:*

- o neighbouring local authorities will not invest in road improvements that will not bring economic benefit to their areas
- o joint working transport strategies with Hampshire County Council welcomed

- The plan fails to address the Duty to Cooperate requirements and transparently show how housing figures have been arrived at.

*Sustainable development:*

- The plan fails to direct housing towards the most sustainable settlements and relies too much on rural settlements.
- The plan fails to give sufficient weight to the need to promote sustainable patterns of development.
- support for residential development in close proximity to services

*Sustainable transport:*

- support for provision of new sustainable transport infrastructure. More is needed to alleviate through traffic issues in Wimborne (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Concerns that road improvements will not take place until developments are completed. Query regarding Canford Bottom roundabout (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Minimising strategic transport and accessibility needs - refer to benefits to residents and biodiversity in reducing travel and using sustainable transport (**Natural England**)
- Policy 3.10 should include criteria for superior bus stops that should be on high quality bus corridors, funded by the developer.
- Discussions surrounding potential materials and costings for trailways. Support for joining old railway line in Alderholt to Fordingbridge and Verwood to create a sustainable method of transport
- support for policy 3.10. Support improvements to transport corridors subject to bus access being made easier
- support principle of policy 3.10 however should be more robust in specifying segregated cycle lanes linking town, district and local centres

**Draft Policy 3.11 Strategic Transport Improvements**

- support for policy 3.11 including transformational schemes and pinch points

**Draft Policy 3.12 Transport and Development**

- Many comments relating to support for policy 3.12 and also mentioned the following points:
  - objection to spatial strategy
  - should highlight developer contributions may be forthcoming on larger sites to meet the aims and these should be highlighted for larger developments
  - should reorder bullets in priority order as follows: new and improved public transport, pedestrian and cycle routes, then travel plans, car sharing and car clubs, electric vehicle charging points, contributions to transport modelling work and implementation of works to the highway
  - Support for paragraph 3.2.45.
- Plans for Alderholt do not support good access to new development with no railway, lack of public transport and sustainable transport options
- A request that all development include plans for infrastructure

**Draft Policy 3.13 Parking Provision**

- Local plan should point towards relevant parking standards or set them out in an annex

### Draft Policy 3.14 Community Facilities and Services

- support for policy 3.14 however should define types of facilities to which policy applies
- Sports facilities should be included as community facilities in policy 3.14

## 4. Core Policies & Development Management

### 4.1 Environment

#### Draft Policy 4.1 Safeguarding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

##### *Maps*

- Map 4.1.3 Nature Map, does not appear to have any strategic logic. For example, the value of the River Stour appears to be omitted from the areas of the land for landscape scale maintenance. Furthermore, the identification of areas of predominantly arable land in the northern part of the District, within this AONB, does not appear to follow any obvious criteria. The wildlife corridors and stepping stones shown on Map 4.1.4 and 4.1.5 appear, in the absence of further information, to be more of a wish list than a well-reasoned and defined strategy. **(Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Support for inclusion of ecological network maps
- sites of importance for nature conservation
- NIA reference
- support for use of Dorset Ecological Network Maps however need reference - made by DERC for DLNP
- Should use JPEG versions of ecological network map for clarity
- Support for inclusion of Dudsbury Golf Course within Dorset Ecological Networks

##### *Suggestions of further inclusions*

- The AONB should be included within policy 4.1. Should mention that the AONB has a significant role in advising the council. Conflict of policy with NPPF para 17 - policy 4.1 as it is currently written appears to give similar status and protection to internationally designated sites, national ones, and local sites, in addition to ones that are described but not given any specific designation. **(Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Policies 4.1 and 4.29 should state that the new forest has the highest level of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty **(New Forest District Council Policy Planning)**
- Include paragraph referencing Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal and phosphate concerns **(Natural England)**

##### *Additional comments*

- Mention of AONB management plan alongside heathland mitigation in 4.1.11 **(Landscape and Planning Advisor Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Support for inclusion of:
  - o Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal process
  - o Section on irreplaceable habitats
  - o Biodiversity net gain

##### *Wording*

- Policy should be titled 'geological conservation' **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- Strengthen wording surrounding ecological networks
- Strengthen wording surrounding net gains and remove 'where possible' from wording of bullet 3 in policy 3.3 and 4.1.

- 'Habitats regulations' should be amended to 'habitats and species regulations 2017'
- Greater reference should be made to providing high quality and biodiverse greenspace to improve health outcomes
- An explicit mention to the Natural Environment Team should be made

#### Draft Policy 4.2 Protection of the Dorset Heathlands

Large support for policy 4.2 protecting heathlands through SANGs. Further, more detailed comments were as follows:

- Support for policy 4.2 Dorset heaths protection (**Dorset CPRE**)
- 40 dwellings is appropriate trigger for consideration of HIPs (**Natural England**)
- Policy 4.2 should allow flexibility where there is a demonstrable benefit to heathlands
- SANGs should be sited close to development
- Policy should state that the new forest has the highest level of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty
- support for strengthening of Dorset ecological networks, should include climate change adaptation measures
- Financial contributions of provision of SANGs would need to come forwards in advance of the residential development they seek to mitigate, or in a phased approach for larger sites.

#### *Suggestions over further clarification and detail:*

- A lack of national guidance on protection of nationally and internationally designated sites. should also reference Natural England's concerns about phosphates and nitrates and Avon Catchment and Solent (**Natural England**)
- confusion between heathland mitigation and strategic green infrastructure (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)
- mention of AONB management plan alongside heathland mitigation in 4.1.11 (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)
- welcome further clarification on SANG provision
- map 3.2.1 should show 5km buffer

#### *Comments surrounding further protection to heathlands:*

- SANGs should be permanent. Objection to contributions to strategic SANGs as they do not enhance or protect character of the local area where development has taken place. (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- support for contributions towards strategic SANG where on site is not possible if strategic SANG is close enough, or planning permission should be refused
- support for protection of heathlands through either S106 or CIL. Comment surrounding clarification where SANGs cannot be 'physically' provided, and clarity around sizes of SANGs or costs involved with S106s. These should not impact deliverability/viability.
- Objection to development that takes places near heathland as it is protected.

#### *Suggested alterations to policy:*

- Objections to wording of SANG provision para 4.1.24 onwards (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)

- Policy 3.5 the policy is welcomed, the second part of the policy gives a misleading order of priority, the second and third bullets should be moved up to be first and second (**Natural England**)
- Heathlands policies could limit, restrict or burden tourist opportunities within AONB areas within 5km of heathlands. Policy 4.37 should not apply to tourism proposals that relate to AONB tourism (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)
- Rethink 5km buffer in places as landscape character differs (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)
- Updated NPPF - approach to plan will need to be revisited.
- Proposing a 'Strategic' SANG at Dudsbury Park to serve the wider area

#### Draft Policy 4.3 Sustainable Development and New Development

- Support for policy 4.3
- enhanced energy efficiency has not been assessed for viability in policies 4.3 and 4.4
- needs reference to biodiverse green space - reference policy 4.1
- Further clarification required regarding water efficiency standards
- policy 4.3 should have enhanced energy efficiency requirements assessed for viability
- support for policy 4.3 subject to deliverability and viability not being impacted
- policy 4.3 and 4.4 unsupported by evidence as to how and where requirements could be achieved, given the move away from set standards in the Code and the statements in the revised National Planning Policy Framework. Merely encouraging applicants to consider issues does not provide the certainty required of a local plan policy and as such the policies are meaningless and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Suggestion that policies 4.3 and 4.4 should therefore be combined and amended
- Development will be expected, subject to viability, to incorporate appropriate design measures to reduce energy use and demonstrate how it minimises resource and energy consumption, compared to the minimum target under current Building Regulations legislation, and how it is designed to withstand the longer term impacts of climate change.
- Further, under the title of Sustainable Development (or Design) reference should be made to how development proposals will be considered against Building for Life 12 requirements. This would reflect paragraph 129 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework which supports the use of Building for Life 12

#### Draft Policy 4.4 Renewable energy provision for residential and non-residential developments

##### *Key comments:*

- Could energy recovery facilities be included in the policy (**Minerals and Waste Dorset County Council**)
- Objection to development and proposed deletion. The starting point for the reduction of energy consumption should be an energy hierarchy of energy reduction, energy efficiency, renewable energy and then finally low carbon energy as outlined in Draft Policy 4.3. The policy should take a 'fabric first' approach which by improving fabric specification increases thermal efficiency and so reduces heating and electricity usage. Plans should identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers to help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat (revised NPPF para 151c). The revised NPPF does



not stipulate that the Council should be seeking connection to such energy supply systems. Indeed such a requirement is unfair to future consumers by restricting their ability to change energy supplier. **(Home Builders Federation)**

- As written, the policy is unsupported by evidence as to how and where the requirements could be achieved, given the move away from set standards in the Code and the statements in the revised National Planning Policy Framework. The policy should be combined with Policy 4.3 to ensure incorporation of appropriate design measures to reduce energy use and demonstrate how it minimises resource and energy consumption, compared to the minimum target under current Building Regulations legislation, and how it is designed to withstand the longer term impacts of climate change. Further, under the title of Sustainable Development (or Design) reference should be made to how development proposals will be considered against Building for Life 12 requirements.
- The 10% target seems arbitrary

*Specific viability comments:*

- Support for policy 4.4 subject to deliverability and viability not being impacted
- Agreement with general approach but potential viability issues arise which - could be negotiated through pre-application
- Policy 4.4 should have enhanced energy efficiency requirements assessed for viability

**Draft Policy 4.5 Sources of Renewable Energy**

- No specific comments received

**Draft Policy 4.6 Flood Management, Mitigation, and Defence**

Many comments were received in support of Policy 4.6 and included further comments as follows:

- Agreement with policy 4.6 and support for developments not increasing flood risk elsewhere **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Support for policy 4.6 however would not support any flood mitigation measure that resulted in loss of amenity space for existing users of the land in order to provide development **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**

*Further recommendations for the policy/section:*

- Request for additional test. The drainage can be constrained when the river levels causing flooding **(Dorset County Council Flood Risk Management)**
- Recommendation to expand section 4.1.4 to include off-site surface water, waste and pollution caused by new development
- Clarity needed around how many dwellings drainage policy applies to
- Reference should be made to DCC as the LLFA
- Change 'flood zones' to 'areas at risk from flooding' to include all types of flooding and not just fluvial
- inclusion of additional measures to address combined risk of surface water and groundwater flooding
- flood risk should be considered within flood risk assessment and high groundwater levels should be considered within drainage design

- evidence base studies (2008 SFRA) are outdated and do not include surface water maps, groundwater risk areas and more recent flood information
- land east of new road request for further test in relation to flood risk - land to north at risk of flooding so should be accommodated

#### *Constraints map:*

- comments surrounding requirement for inclusion of surface water flood risk in constraint mapping
- constraints map must consider known areas of flood risk and surface water flood risk

#### *Further points raised:*

- flooding text should be strengthened to include groundwater and surface water risk
- south-west is a local low spot subject to flooding (**Dorset County Council Flood Risk Management**)
- objection to Gladelands development on flooding grounds
- comment stating strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment
- comments surrounding land for surface water attenuation. The level and location of flood storage required to support this option will be agreed in consultation with the Environment Agency

#### **Draft Policy 4.7 Protection of Groundwater**

- It is important to protect sources of water as our population increases so much. (**Dorset CPRE**)

#### **Draft Policy 4.8 Waste Facilities in new development**

- The Waste Planning Authority welcomes this policy as it requires new development proposals to provide facilities for the collection and transfer of waste. However, the WPA would question why this policy as drafted is particularly focused on development proposals of a commercial nature. This policy or a separate policy should ensure that residential developments incorporate adequate facilities on-site to allow occupiers to store and separate their waste. Unless the authority is intending to rely on Policy 22 'Waste from new developments' of the emerging Waste Plan. (**DCC Minerals and Waste**)
- Agree with processing waste near to where it has been generated (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Site options coincide with the mineral safeguarding area and Minerals and Waste would not often be able to support this - assessments of minerals on site would need to be done. Potential conflict between Minerals and Waste plan and East Dorset Local Plan- East of New Rd, west of New Rd, Holmwood House, South of Leigh Rd, Brood Rd, Cuthbury Allotments, St Margarets Close, parts of North eastern and north western Verwood. These should be treated as constraints. (**DCC Minerals and Waste**)
- More detail regarding minerals safeguarding area should be mentioned in the plan (**DCC Minerals and Waste**)
- Comment relating to para 3.2.22 regarding waste management facilities and employment land. Excess demand for employment land means waste management facilities can be developed on employment sites to meet identified need (**DCC Minerals and Waste**)
- Comments to paragraph 2.0.10 - the Minerals Plan large areas of land are proposed to be safeguarded for minerals extraction. The Mineral Planning Authority should be consulted on non-waste developments within these areas. Wherever possible the Mineral Planning Authority

would seek prior extraction. Additionally, there are some major issues relating to waste disposal that are to be addressed in coming years and these need to be taken into account. There is to be less landfill and more recycling and other means of waste recovery disposal. This will require locations for recycling and waste treatment facilities plants. **(DCC Minerals and Waste)**

- Queries whether recycling site in Brook Road will be adequate in the near future and whether fly tipping has been considered **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- The Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Minerals Strategy (2014) identifies a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA). Policy SG1 of the Minerals Strategy applies to relevant proposals within the MSA. The Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Waste Plan (Pre-Submission Draft 2017) identifies Safeguarded Waste Facilities. Policy 24 will apply to relevant proposals within 250m of the Safeguarded Waste Facilities following adoption. The Mineral Planning Authority would expect assessment and possibly prior extraction of the resource on these sites. This should be identified as a potential constraint/opportunity within the local plan. **(DCC Minerals and Waste)**
- Brook Road sewage treatment works is proposed for safeguarding in the emerging Waste Plan. Non- waste proposals nearby should not constrain the future operation of this facility. Considering proposals at the plan making stage provides the opportunity to build suitable mitigation into the proposal to reduce conflicts between the waste facility and the non-waste development. Brook Road Household Recycling Centre is also proposed for safeguarding in the emerging Waste Plan. Non- waste proposals nearby should not constrain the future operation of this facility. Considering proposals at the plan making stage provides the opportunity to build suitable mitigation into the proposal to reduce conflicts between the waste facility and the non-waste development. **(DCC Minerals and Waste)**

#### Draft Policy 4.9 Pollution and existing development

- The test in draft policy 4.9 sets the bar too high, as proposals that have material harm on a single dwelling would be caught by this policy wording and could restrict the delivery of much needed new homes. The reference should be amended to make it very clear that it would have to be significant unmitigated material harm.

#### Draft Policy 4.10 Drainage and new development

- Support for draft policy 4.10 and its requirement for SuDS and the mechanism for allowing the requirement to be relaxed where there is clear evidence it would be inappropriate

## 4.2 Green Belt

#### Draft Policy 4.11 - Replacement Buildings in the Green Belt

- Policy 4.11 should also apply to the AONB **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Support **(Dorset CPRE)**

#### Draft Policy 4.12 - Extensions to Existing Buildings in the Green Belt, and Ancillary Development

- Objection to bullet point iii) of policy 4.12 as it is written. Some pavilions require additional parking and storage to comply with modern standards. **(Principal Planning Manager Sports England)**
- Support **(Dorset CPRE)**

#### Draft Policy 4.13 - Village Infill development in the Green Belt

- Clarification needed over why development is being allowed in settlements that lie both within the Green Belt and AONB namely Edmondsham and Hinton Martell - suggestion that either those two villages are removed from the list or that a clear and understandable case is made for permitting development in those villages that are both within the AONB and the Green Belt.
- Support for policy 4.13 referring to village infill development within the Green Belt (**National Trust**)
- Support (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Content with the approach, although envelope boundary to Longham Court is requested to be altered to allow secondary access at Dudsbury Park.

#### Draft Policy 4.14 - Sheiling School and the Lantern Community (St Leonards) and Sturts Farm Community (West Moors)

- Support for policy 4.14 (**Dorset CPRE**)
- welcome the inclusion of site specific policy 4.14 within the emerging Local Plan to help support development at the SSET, it must be questioned why the site should not instead be removed from the Green Belt entirely. Removal from the Green Belt would significantly reduce the policy hurdles to development at the site, enabling the Council to continue to support the nationally important facilities without being hamstrung by Green Belt policy.

#### *General comments surrounding schools in the Green Belt:*

- Paragraph is discriminatory and misleading and should be reworded (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Objection to approach to limited development at private schools within the greenbelt
- Objection to dismissal of Dumpton School and keeping it in the greenbelt
- Support for policies as they allow schools to develop

### 4.3 Housing

#### Draft policy 4.15 Size and type of new dwellings

- Support for draft policy 4.15 (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Add paragraph to policy 4.15 to cover development ensuring health and active lifestyles and compliance with the Essex Design Code/Active Design Guidance (**Sport England**)
- Support policy 4.15, should consider distance to bus stops, access to main corridors and should be amended to take account of CIHT guidance along prime transport corridors
- Support for the plan's pragmatic approach to the efficient use of a land resource. However this does not align with draft policy 4.15 whose requirement for all dwellings to meet NDSS would result in reduced site capacities.
- Policy 4.15 requiring NDSS requires a viability assessment as there may be impacts and there is no evidence proffered to underpin the need for the application of the NDSS
- Concerns in relation to the standards being used as a tool to dictate housing mix on individual sites. Clarification required as it could result in conflict with local character
- Querying testing of NDSS and flexibility of them required in policy to reflect market demands

#### Draft policy 4.16 Design, layout and density of new housing development

- Objection to removal of Special Character Area status- there is no justification (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Should define planning definition of 'character' (**Wimborne Minster Town Council**)
- Should refer to local design studies to reflect the character of the area in new builds (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Policy 4.16 should reference sport England active design guidance (**Sport England**)
- The policy does not align with policy 4.15 where dwellings are required to meet NDSS which would result in reduced site capacities
- Draft Policy 4.16 should also comply with revised NPPF requirements for affordable home ownership
- Support for policy 4.16 but requires viability testing
- support for policy 4.16, should be amended to take into account CIHT guidance along prime transport corridors and should direct users to main corridors

#### Draft Policy 4.17 Provision of Affordable Housing

- Support for policy 4.17 however should promote affordable housing on minor AONB sites (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)
- Failure to deliver adequate numbers of affordable homes since the adoption of Core Strategy is worrying. The large number of market homes drives up need. (**East Dorset Environment Partnership**)
- The AONB location of a village should be mentioned explicitly in the section on allocations. Furthermore, because an AONB location gives a significant financial premium to developers (recent research by Savills indicates it is in the order of 26% over that of comparable properties outside of the AONB) the AONB Partnership is of the view that development, other than affordable housing, within the AONB should make a contribution to AONB purposes as set out in the adopted AONB Management Plan. That could be via the Community Infrastructure Levy or by a separate developer contribution that reflects the value uplift of an AONB location. In relation to affordable housing within the AONB the Council should set a lower threshold for affordable housing of five units or fewer as set out in paragraph 63 of the NPPF. The advice of the AONB Partnership is that where more than two units comprise a development there should be affordable housing contributions. (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)
- Requirement for viability assessment for 50% and 40% affordable housing requirements. Requirement for clarity within policy 4.17 which accessibility standards are required
- Various comments of support for policy 4.17
- should reassess need for affordable housing based on new NPPF definition
- Should have permanent reduction going forwards based on market value eg 80%
- should remove words 'up to' 40% and 50% requirement as it seems open to challenge. Instead state '35% minimum'
- targets are exceptionally high ahead of preparation of evidence base. Rarely possible to achieve. Setting unrealistic expectations. Revised NPPF and PPG - need to review approach in light of this and viability evidence. Engagement with promoters and landowners needed in preparing viability evidence.
- mixing affordable/social housing with private housing doesn't work

- objection to policy 4.17 on the ground of 50% affordable housing target being too high and not justified in accordance with para 35 of NPPF

*Requirement for alterations due to evidence base:*

- The accompanying viability report is dated 2010 and was clearly produced to accompany the evidence for the Core Strategy. For instance, the report does not consider the Community Infrastructure Levy which was introduced in East Dorset after the adoption of the Core Strategy. This evidence needs to be updated for the revised local plan. Without evidence to support the affordable housing targets, this policy is fundamentally flawed.
- Requirement for updates to affordable housing calculations based off standard methodology and new NPPF definition
- Viability evidence is outdated and would be found unsound

**Draft policy 4.18 Exception sites for the provision of affordable housing**

- Support for caveat at the end of the policy that allocated sites should be developed before any exception site is permitted. **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Support for policy 4.18
- There is a need to properly address an emerging policy requirement related to 'entry level' exception sites which now need to be properly identified in the Green Belt Villages due to the wording of Paragraph 71 and footnote 34 of the NPPF 2018.

**Draft policy 4.19 Residential infill development criteria**

- We approve of the very limited in-filling in the smaller villages. It would be good though if it was not market housing. **(Dorset CPRE)**

**Draft policy 4.20 Housing and Accommodation Proposals for Vulnerable People**

- Support for policy **(Dorset CPRE)**

**Draft policy 4.21 Housing for elderly persons accommodation**

- These provisions are covered by Design of New Development draft policy 4.27. These criteria should not be specific to elderly person's accommodation.
- The plan makes no provision for housing for elderly - left to private sector. Support for extra care development near Ferndown in Green Belt
- Support for policy to provide smaller homes for meeting the needs of an ageing population
- Highlights the importance of providing specialist accommodation for the elderly to bring family homes onto the market
- Clarification sought re what the LPA regards as Class C2 and non-C2 residential development for older and vulnerable people

**Draft policy 4.22 Criteria for development of 'granny annexes' on residential dwellings**

- Support for policy 4.22 Criteria for development of 'granny annexes' on residential dwellings **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Further discussion wanted regarding how 400m heathland considerations can be incorporated into this policy **(Natural England Dorset and Somerset Team)**

**Draft policy 4.23 Agricultural Dwellings**

- Support for policy 4.23 **(Dorset CPRE and Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**

## 4.4 Heritage & Conservation

### Draft policy 4.24 Valuing and Conserving our Historic Environment

- Support for policy 4.24 Valuing and Conserving our Historic Environment (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Important to actively deliver conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Suggestion of producing a heritage topic paper. (**Historic England**)

### Draft policy 4.25 Demolition of Unlisted Buildings in Conservation Areas

- Support for policy 4.25 Demolition of Unlisted Buildings in Conservation Areas (**Dorset CPRE**)

### Draft policy 4.26 New Development in or Close to Conservation Areas

- Support for policy 4.26 New Development in or Close to Conservation Areas (**Dorset CPRE**)

## 4.5 Landscape, Design & Open Spaces

### Draft Policy 4.27 Design of New Development

- Support for policy 4.27 (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Should set clear vision and expectations for development with standards that have been subject to viability testing
- objection to removal of special character area status (**West Parley Parish Council**)
- support for consideration of section 17 of crime and disorder act 1998 in new developments. Support for involvement of crime prevention design advisor- these should be involved with major applications and housing for vulnerable groups (**Crime Prevention and Design Advisor Dorset Police**)
- Support for policy subject to lower densities being recognised as appropriate in some places depending on local character and distinctiveness

### Draft Policy 4.28 Criteria for External Lighting on Developments

- Support for policy 4.28 (**Dorset CPRE**)
- General support for policy, proposed alterations to the policy included:
  - o Cool light sources should be avoided (**East Dorset Environment Partnership**)
  - o Should be more reference to potential harmful effects of artificial lighting on wildlife in the text and reference to the importance of appropriate light 'colour temperature' to minimise these effects within the policy wording. The correlated colour temperature (CCT) of artificial lighting refers to the colour appearance of the light emitted, and is measured in degrees Kelvin (K). At 2000K to 3000K, the light produced is called warm white and ranges from orange to yellow-white in appearance. Colour temperatures between 3100K and 4500K are called cool white. Wherever possible, the warm white (lower temperature) orange end of the colour spectrum should be used in external lighting as this appears to cause less disturbance to circadian rhythms in humans and other animals, and therefore less disturbance to nocturnal wildlife, than the cool white (higher temperature) blue end of the spectrum. (**Dorset Wildlife Trust**)
  - o Support for policy and the intention to restrict light pollution generally. Natural England advise that another point e. is inserted which makes reference the need for an agreed lighting strategy where impacts on biodiversity eg bats, nightjar, invertebrates are identified. (**Natural England**)



- Support for policy but recommend more information and reference to the impacts artificial lighting has on wildlife and the need to minimise these impacts. **(Dorset Local Nature Partnership)**
- Support for policy, it is particularly helpful to see the importance and status of the AONB's Dark Skies has been explained. The reference to the important document by the Institute of Lighting Professionals in paragraph 4.5.11 is also particularly helpful. Proposed alterations to policy to align with development management with rewording as follows: 'Proposals for development that require involve external lighting will need to demonstrate that; the lighting is the minimum required for the specified use; light spill is minimised; lighting fixtures, including generators, columns and junction boxes are located to prevent visual intrusion; and within the Cranborne Chase AONB or within its setting, the requirements of the AONB Position Statement on light pollution and Good Practice Guides on Good Lighting incorporated in the adopted AONB Management Plan are taken into account. Applicants should submit lighting plots, and column and luminaire details to demonstrate that the scheme does not cause significant light spill and, where relevant, complies with AONB criteria. Conditions may be used to limit the hours of operation.' **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Section should outline harm caused by increased levels of outdoor lighting on natural environment but also human health **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**

#### Draft Policy 4.29 Landscape Quality and Character

- concerns that draft policy 4.29 makes no mention of AONB **(Cranborne and West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- should state that the new forest has the highest level of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty **(Natural England)**
- Support for policy 4.29 **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Support for considerations around quality and history of rivers within landscape habitat and suggestions for improvements **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**

#### Draft Policy 4.30 Open Space, Leisure and Green Infrastructure

- Support for Policy 4.30 Open Space, Leisure and Green Infrastructure **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Contributions cannot be sought from policy 4.30 as the strategy is 11 years old and unsound. Needs new sports and recreation studies **(Sport England)**
- Object to policy 4.30 as evidence is outdated and contrary to NPPF. Requires playing pitch strategy and build facilities strategy to reinform requirements **(Sport England)**
- Sports needs assessments should be updated every 3 years **(Sports England)**
- Objection to wording of policy 4.30 where the council should not place burdensome requirements on developments which impact deliverability/viability - requirements should be relaxed where they would impact this
- Policy 4.30 should seek to contribute towards open spaces where development necessitates new or improved infrastructure or where mitigation is required
- 2007 study is aged and likely to be out of date. Dudsbury Golf Course - possible to meet standards of policy 4.30 - current use unlikely to remain viable. Potential public and community benefits - would also assists in realisation of Stour Valley Park.



## 4.6 Economic Growth

### Draft Policy 4.31 East Dorset Employment Land Hierarchy

- Support (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Blunts Farm is allocated as a strategic higher quality site. As a result, employment activity within non B class will only be considered in specific circumstances. It is suggested that the exceptions should include waste management facilities that serve the needs of local community. It is suggested that the text be amended as follows: 'Non employment uses ancillary to core employment functions will be considered where such facilities are required to meet the needs of workers and the local community. The Waste Planning Authority welcomes the more flexible approach set out for other industrial estates with East Dorset as set out in Policy 4.31 and for the development of alternative uses within Draft Policy 4.32. (**DCC Minerals and Waste**)
- Paragraph 4.6.6 acknowledges that rural parts of the District provide only limited employment and facilities. Concerns with paragraph conclusion which raises concerns that the council is proposing to distribute a disproportionately large quantum of additional housing to the rural service centres, particularly to Alderholt. The 'rise of the internet' is not a sound basis on which to propose significant residential development to rural areas and will increase pollution and social isolation for some.
- Major inconsistency in document where patterns of development are being proposed which are clearly unsustainable, but which appear nevertheless to have been put forward, presumably to reduce the level of Green Belt release.
- Support for industrial estates listed as they are all established sites with good or reasonably road links and close to centres of population.

### Draft Policy 4.32 Alternative Uses for Employment Land Where Justified by Market Evidence

- Support (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Support
- Queries what the 'infrastructure constraints' listed are

### Draft Policy 4.33 Electronic Communications Network

- Support (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Proposed rewording to only allow darker coloured installations in AONB to mitigate impacts (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)

### Draft Policy 4.34 Conversion and Re-use of Existing Buildings for Economic Development

- Support subject to Brexit (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Support for policy (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)

### Draft Policy 4.35 New Development and Rural Diversification

- Support subject to Brexit (**Dorset CPRE**)
- Proposed alterations to text to say 'Proposals will be supported for the development and diversification of agricultural and other land based rural businesses that meet the criteria set out in NPPF' (**East Dorset Environment Partnership**)
- Policy should include guidance from the AONB team (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)
- Reference to AONB is useful (**Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB**)

- Sports should be included in the list of leisure activities **(Sports England)**

#### Draft Policy 4.36 Shops and Community Facilities in local Centres and Villages

- Support **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Support for policy **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Support in principle however proposed alterations of wording to 'The loss of existing retail premises, sport, leisure and other local facilities will be resisted unless it is clearly demonstrated there is insufficient demand and it is not feasible and viable to support their continued existence and the loss would not result in a substantial decline in the range and quality of services for local people. Any proposed loss would need to be justified by evidence of an implemented marketing strategy over an 18-month period which had been agreed by the local planning authority.' So local authorities say 12 months but for voluntary groups 18 months is a reasonable time in which they can seek to acquire local facilities which are to be lost. **(Sports England)**

#### Draft Policy 4.37 Tourism

- Support **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Section should be added into policy to mitigate wildlife harm **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**
- Support for policy **(Natural England)**
- Policy must recognize that town centres often support more rural communities **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**

#### Draft Policy 4.38 Camping and Caravan Sites

- Clarity required over wording with regards to the AONB **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Policy 4.38 should reference how sites within 400m of heathlands are not permitted and add some text regarding the Dorset Ecological Network **(Natural England)**

### 4.7 Bournemouth Airport

#### Draft Policy 4.39 Bournemouth Airport Aerodrome Safeguarding

No specific comments.

#### Draft Policy 4.40 Development and Aircraft Noise

- The constraints on development close to the airport are noted. Natural England advise that it would be useful to agree some clarification guidance with the airport concerning the size of areas of water and their function which are likely to be acceptable in terms of being of negligible importance to birds likely to affect operations. **(Natural England, Dorset and Somerset Team)**

## 5. Site Allocations and Area Based Policies

### Introduction

- No specific comments on site allocations however wider considerations should be made to the green infrastructure opportunities within site allocations. Currently these focus on allotment provision and development of SANGs. Consideration should be made for opportunities for green infrastructure within developments such as delivering wildlife corridors, adapting to higher temperatures and managing water for example through green roofs/walls and tree planting. **(Dorset Local Nature Partnership)**
- For the Council to maximize housing supply, the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location, are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increasing housing supply is increasing the number of sales outlets whilst large strategic sites may have multiple outlets usually increasing the number of sales outlets available inevitably means increasing the number of housing site allocations. So large strategic sites should be complimented by smaller scale non-strategic sites. This approach is also advocated in the Housing White Paper (HWP) 'Fixing the Broken Housing Market' because a good mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways and creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector. **(Local Plans Home Builders Federation)**

### 5.1 Wimborne, Colehill & Corfe Mullen

#### 5.1.1 - Introduction

- Introduction section 5.1.1.1 should include sports as a key infrastructure requirement to support new development. **(Sport England)**

#### 5.1.2 - Housing

##### *General comments – Wimborne*

- Suggestion for the removal of Allenbourne Playing Fields from the Green Belt. **(Dorset County Council)**
- Objections to proposed release of land at Wimborne Model Village from the Green Belt as it may open the land up to development.
- Development should enhance the ecological setting of the Rivers Allen and Wim. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**
- Objection to the inclusion of Grange End into village envelope as it would extend into the countryside.
- Support for the rejection of sites that would encroach into the countryside.
- Objections to infilling the gap between Wimborne and Colehill **(Wimborne Town Council)**
- Suggestion to remove reference to poor condition of rugby pitches at Leigh Park Recreation Ground, as the playing field is a field in trust. **(Wimborne Town Council)**
- Queries regarding housing numbers and references to the updated National Planning Policy Framework.
- Queries regarding lack of largescale development proposed at Wimborne Minster.

- Objections to development at Wimborne on the basis of pollution impacts, poor infrastructure, impact on the town's character, and concern regarding loss of greenspace and recreational space.
- No further comments to add regarding 600 new homes at Cranborne Road new neighbourhood **(Dorset County Council Economy)**

#### *General comments – Corfe Mullen*

- Bus service at Corfe Mullen is vulnerable and development is unlikely to change this. Highway route improvements through the town would be detrimental for residents as they would attract even more traffic. **(Corfe Mullen Parish Council)**
- Transport modelling work being undertaken will inform the refinement of housing options. Highways England will therefore wait on the model outputs to become available before commenting on site allocations in the Corfe Mullen area. Modelling should include assessment of any SRN impact seen as a result of the allocated developments, namely impacts at the A31 / Blandford Road and A31 / B3078 / Wimborne Road junctions. **(Highways England)**
- Objection to the deletion of local designations (AGLV and SCA). The areas are precious to the community, and insufficient protection would be provided by other policies. **(Corfe Mullen Parish Council)**
- The area is the most sustainable in the district.
- Further explanation is required for how housing numbers were derived.
- Support for identifying Corfe Mullen as a main settlement, and for its housing strategy.
- Objections to development at Corfe Mullen, and its identification as a main settlement.
- Important to maximise the market potential of employment sites in East Dorset in a way that is sensitive to the types of business already located within the district and looking to locate within the district. Candy's Lane industrial site should be listed as an employment site in Corfe Mullen.
- Comments on mapping inaccuracies.
- Concerns over general dismantling of Green Belt and viability of development at Corfe Mullen.

#### *General comments – Colehill*

- Suggestion to remove St. Michael's Middle School playing fields from the Green Belt. **(Dorset County Council)**

#### *Other general comments*

- Second home ownership is a concern for the area, would houses be reserved for locals?
- The following sites were promoted for development:
  - o Land abutting the Ferndown bypass
  - o Land at Willow Drive
  - o Land at Leigh Farm, Wimborne
  - o Land north of Wimborne Road, Colehill
  - o Land West of Wimborne Rd West, Wimborne.
  - o Land east of Newton Lane
  - o Site at Parady's Hill
  - o Land west and east of Hayward's Lane
  - o Land at 6 Leigh Lane
  - o Land at Stone Park
  - o Land North and South of the A31

- Land at Wimborne Minster
- Land to the South of Canford Bottom roundabout
- Land to the east and southeast of Colehill
- Land at Northleigh Lane (omission site)
- Land south and east of Sleight Lane
- Land at Casa Loma, Colehill (would need to be released from the Green Belt)

#### Draft Policy 5.1 - Cuthbury Allotments and St Margaret's Close New Neighbourhoods

- Support for housing development at Cuthbury Allotments and St Margaret's Close New Neighbourhoods **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Support for the policy, and the requirement for contributions towards education provision. **(Dorset County Council)**
- Potential impacts on the A31 and the requirement of further assessment and transport modelling, and as part of a cumulative assessment to identify impacts of the Local Plan on East Dorset as a whole. **(Highways England)**
- Support for the policy, however reference should be made to Sport England's Active Design Guidance. **(Sport England)**
- Support for the policy subject to improvements to Julian's Bridge having bus priority, improvements to sub stops on Julian's Road and Victoria Road, and a contribution towards bus Service 3. **(Go South West)**
- Requirement for pedestrian crossing at Victoria Road, evidence needed in support of requirement for traffic light control system at Julian's Bridge, and suggestion that here should be a pedestrian walkway here. **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- Objection to St. Margaret's neighbourhood development as Wimborne Cemetery was hoping to acquire land for burial purposes. There are badger setts along the North-North East border of site so must be considered. **(Wimborne Minster Town Council).**
- Objections to the policy as it doesn't include any employment provision, and concerns that the neighbouring cemetery is running out of land.

#### Draft Policy 5.2 – South of Leigh Road

- The council's open space, sports and recreation survey is outdated and cannot be relied upon. **(Sport England)**
- Support for policy 5.2. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Potential impacts on the strategic road network, namely the A31 via the A31 / B3078 or A31 / A341 / Merley House Lane junctions. Assessment required of potential impacts through transport modelling, and as part of a cumulative assessment to identify impacts of the Local Plan on East Dorset as a whole. **(Highways England)**
- Support for the policy, however reference should be made to Sport England's Active Design Guidance. **(Sport England)**
- Support for the policy subject to amendments. The site is not served by public transport and is hard to serve by bus due to its location. The policy should be amended to say development should contribute towards bus services to Wimborne. **(Go South West)**
- Objections to the policy based on impact on traffic congestion, highway safety, and insufficient infrastructure.

- Concerns regarding the proposed amended Green Belt boundary, and the suggestion that this is amended to line up with a neighbouring field.

#### Draft Policy 5.3 – South of Leigh Road New Neighbourhood and Sports Village

- The proposed Green Belt boundary is inconsistent with the defensible boundary on the ground, and should be redefined. **(Dorset County Council)**
- Recognition required as to where the existing Children’s and Community Centre on the site would be relocated too. **(Dorset County Council)**
- Consideration of flood risk is required. **(Dorset County Council)**
- Support for policy 5.3. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Potential impacts on the strategic road network, namely the A31 via the Canford Bottom or A31/A341/Merley House Lane junctions. The Canford Bottom junction already experiences issues with congestion during peak operation. Assessment required of potential impacts through transport modelling, and as part of a cumulative assessment to identify impacts of the Local Plan on East Dorset as a whole. **(Highways England)**
- Support for policy 5.3 in principle however reference to the Sport England Active Design Guide is required in line with section 8 of the NPPF. The details of the allocation cause concern, and requires up to date evidence. There may be a case to say that there is more area required and the sporting mix may include one or more floodlit artificial grass pitches. **(Sport England)**
- Objection to policy 5.3, as the site is not accessible by public transport and therefore is unsustainable, and is contrary to policy 3.12. It cannot be proven that a high quality public transport choice can be provided and financially sustained over the construction period. **(Go South West)**
- Existing STW has capacity but works to provide additional capacity would be required medium to long term. **(Wessex Water)**
- Support for the policy, however it should be updated to reflect extant outline permissions, rather than just rolled forward.

#### Draft Policy 5.4 – Housing options at Corfe Mullen

##### *Pardy’s Hill and Hayward’s Lane*

- Objections to development at Pardy’s Hill, and Hayward’s Lane, on the basis of impact on wildlife habitats, landscape, flooding issues, and traffic/highway safety concerns. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- Objection to allocation of land at Sleight Lane/Pardy’s Hill and east and west of Haywards Lane due to impact on protected habitats. Development would require substantial mitigation and compensation. Detailed ecological survey would be required prior to any allocation. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**

##### *Cogdean Elms Industrial Estate*

- Development at Cogdean Elms Industrial estate would require remedial measures in relation to pollution from dry-cleaning solvents. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership, Dorset Wildlife Trust)**
- Development of Cogdean Industrial estate would lead to a loss of much-needed employment, objection on this basis. **(Corfe Mullen Parish Council)**

- Development of Cogdean Elms Industrial Estate would be the most suitable out of those proposed.

#### *Lamb's Green*

- Allocation at Lamb's Green would be required to provide access through Green Infrastructure to the proposed Stour Valley Nature Park. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**

#### *Ecology*

- Natural England has had no contact with promoters in this location and hence no SANG is available for consideration. The same applies for biodiversity information relating to the habitats (a spring grassland survey is particularly required) and species present. Both will need to be provided to enable allocations to be properly assessed. Grassland habitats, spring lines, landscape impacts will need to be assessed. 5.4 should identify the need to provide suitable biodiversity mitigation and compensation in addition to the SANG. **(Natural England)**
- Sites LPR-REG18-127 and 89 lie within an area known as the Waterloo Valley to the west of Corfe Mullen. Existing priority habitat including stream, mature hedges and trees are likely to be important wildlife corridors which link to areas of SNCI woodland and SSSI species rich meadow at the lower end of the valley. Loss of land here to development would be considered difficult to mitigate and therefore would lead to fragmentation of existing habitat of high value to wildlife. **(RSPB)**
- Concerns regarding the impacts of development on surrounding habitats, ecology, and nearby heathlands.

#### *Transport*

- Generally considered to be a sustainable location. Bus service improvements to Wimborne and Poole would be required, as well as improvement of cycle and pedestrian links to Wimborne. Highway safety at the Pardy's Hill access needs further consideration. Suggestion of wording in terms of education provision: 'Contributions to education provision (First, Middle and Upper) which may also include a new school site. Where a new school site is provided there will still be the requirements for education provision to all phase (First Middle and Upper). **(Dorset County Council)**
- Objection to policy 5.4 as the sites are not accessible by public transport and not sustainable. **(Go South West)**
- Concerns regarding highway safety impacts (particularly at Pardy's Hill) and existing traffic congestion issues. Lack of parking.

#### *Environment*

- Suggestion of adding paragraphs addressing flood risk at proposed sites. **(Dorset County Council – Flood Risk Management)**
- Concerns regarding loss of Green Belt and landscape impacts.
- Concerns regarding the loss of village character.
- Concerns regarding flooding impacts on development.
- Concerns regarding noise, light and air pollution
- Certain patches of Green Belt are more important than others, and this should be considered.

### *Infrastructure*

- Objection to development in the Green Belt, lack of infrastructure would be made worse by further housing development. Lack of recreational space. **(Corfe Mullen Parish Council)**
- Corfe Mullen STW is reaching the limit of its treatment capacity. Its performance is generally very good. Depending on the rate and timing of new development, additional capacity will be required in the medium to long term. **(Wessex Water)**
- Concerns regarding general lack of infrastructure (such as roads, shops, public transport, and amenities) to support development, resulting in unsustainable development.
- Concerns regarding additional pressure on school and health facilities.
- Concerns regarding lack of employment
- Support for upgrading the existing school.

### *Other*

- Support for policy 5.4. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Support for development in terms of growth of infrastructure and housing.
- Concerns regarding the viability of development due to steep gradients.
- Inconsistency with past refused planning applications.
- The policy does not reflect the government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, and should be reworded.
- Development of Cogdean Elms Industrial Estate would be the most suitable out of those proposed.

### **Draft Policy 5.5 – Land North of Corfe Mullen New Neighbourhood**

- Support for policy 5.5. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Comments stating regret that the allotment has not been delivered. Alternative location should be sought and allocated to allow housing development to proceed. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- North of Wimborne Road Foul flows will be directed to Poole STW. We have plans to provide more capacity during Asset Management Plan (AMP)7 (which runs from 2020 to 2025). **(Wessex Water)**

### **5.1.3 Open Space**

#### *Draft Policy 5.6 – Leigh Park Recreation Ground*

- Support for policy 5.6. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Without a robust up to date playing pitch strategy, it is impossible to say that the pitches are not required for rugby or any other pitch sport. Sport England would object to any application which prejudices the use of the playing fields. This is in line the NPPF paragraph 97. **(Sport England)**
- Two thirds of the site is a QE2 Field in Trust, and the remaining should be put into the Trust also, to safeguard the site from future development.

### **5.1.4 Town, District & Local Centres**

#### **Corfe Mullen**

- Existing retail and community facilities are vulnerable, and it is unclear where additional retail and community space could be located. **(Corfe Mullen Parish Council)**



## Draft Policy 5.7 – Wimborne Town Centre Vision

- Support for policy 5.7 Wimborne Town Centre Vision. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Wherever and whenever redevelopment allows, opportunities should be taken to enhance the ecological setting of the rivers Allen and Wim including alien species control and, where appropriate, crown lifting of trees. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- Additional services to be added into to the bullet list, and recommended changes to wording. **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- Regarding crime levels, residents are concerned with antisocial behavior and would support police presence. **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- Recommended consideration of vehicular bridge from Co-Op car park to access High Street Short Stay car park. **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- Regarding accessibility and movement, residents have concerns with increased traffic, stress on old buildings, pollution, and movement around the town for all groups. **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- Opportunities for development should include a transport hub, additional parking, and mixed community use of the old first school. **(Wimborne Minster Town Council)**
- Wherever and whenever redevelopment allows, opportunities should be taken to enhance the ecological setting of the rivers Allen and Wim including alien species control and, where appropriate, crown lifting of trees. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**

## Draft Policy 5.8 – Police and Magistrate's Court Site Retail Allocation

- Support for policy 5.8. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- The majority of trips generated by the development will originate from the surrounding local area and travel in to Wimborne Town Centre. Vehicle trips are therefore likely to access the Town Centre via the local road network. The number of trips generated by the site allocation which will use the SRN are therefore not considered to be of a scale likely to have a severe impact on the operation of the SRN. **(Highways England)**

## 5.2 Ferndown, West Parley and Longham

### 5.2.1 Introduction

- In the absence of an update to date NPPF compliant playing pitch strategy and built facility strategy, Sport England objects to any land allocation or policy which prejudices any playing field or sporting facility. **(Sport England)**

### 5.2.2 Housing

#### *General comments - Ferndown*

- Preference for allocation of smaller sites which would have lesser impacts
- Objection to all development in the vicinity on grounds of the sites being unsuitable, traffic and high car reliance of development with poor public transport provision, poor infrastructure, lack of local services and facilities, environmental and habitats implications, flooding, and objection to removal of SCAs. **(Ferndown Town Council)**
- Any development should deliver biodiversity enhancement (net gain) not simply ensure no harm to the Ferndown Bypass SNCI, and also to the Uddens Heath SSSI and the Moors River, SSSI. All sites that include impact on River Crane / Moors River SSSI should include a condition requiring implementation of the NE/EA draft restoration plan. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**

- The conditions that were approved for the area adopted in Core Strategy should apply. Water attenuation will be a major cost but should not preclude the delivery of affordable housing. Links should be provided to the Stour Valley Nature Park. Land opposite Dudsbury Golf Course Subject to survey and SANG, EDEP has no objections to limited development here. Additional pressure on Poor Common should be avoided. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**

#### *General comments – West Parley*

- Development along the River Stour should be avoided to develop the Stour Valley Nature Park.
- Area of land containing a copse at 88-108 New Road should remain as Green Belt and not removed, due to its contribution to retaining a rural feel to West Parley. **(West Parley Parish Council)**
- General concerns regarding the impact of housing on transport and congestion. Transport modelling is required. **(West Parley Parish Council)**
- This section does not include policy reference to education. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Queries regarding the process of Duty to Cooperate with neighbouring authorities. **(West Parley Parish Council)**
- Comment that West Parley should be referred to in itself and not alongside Ferndown. **(West Parley Parish Council)**
- Concerns about the extent of development. English heritage could release more land to be used instead.

#### *Other general comments*

- Development along the River Stour should be avoided to develop the Stour Valley Nature Park.
- Objection to employment land expansion at Haskins site due to traffic capacity issues which need to be addressed, and impacts on noise and health
- There are areas that suffer from a lack of public transport
- Question of where community facilities would be located.
- Traffic and highway improvements are required.
- The following sites were promoted for development:
  - o Misty Meadows, 147 Ringwood Road
  - o Land to the west of West Parley
  - o Glenacres Nursery, 232 Wimborne Road, Stapehill
  - o Site at Ringwood Road, Ferndown for C2 care home
  - o Land West of Holmwood Park

### **Draft Policy 5.9 - Ferndown, West Parley, Longham Housing Options**

#### *Angel Lane*

- Natural England is yet to see a masterplan and SANG layout. This site is very constrained by its proximity to the Common which will be difficult to effectively mitigate and has a number of complexities due to Rights of Way, Pompeys Lane etc which mean that Natural England would require a greater level of detail than for other sites. Detailed biodiversity assessment is required, as there are a number of high quality grasslands. **(Natural England)**
- Objection to inclusion due to proximity to Ferndown Common SSSI, part of the Dorset Heathlands SPA/Dorset Heaths SAC. A significant increase in housing in proximity to Ferndown

Common will increase urban pressure on this site and lead to further degradation of protected habitats and species populations. **(RSPB)**

- Site to the south of Angel Lane would be suitable for a Care Home use for the frail elderly as set out in the SPD. This area is closest to the designated sites and considered by Natural England to be of greatest risk to not being able to deliver sufficient avoidance/mitigation. **(Natural England)**
- Objection to any large scale housing development on areas to the north of the B3073, due to the inevitable increased pressure it will put on the Ferndown Common European Heathland site. The site has suffered from vandalism and fire. It would also be inappropriate to use the option area LPR REG 18 8 as a SANG, since these should not be located where they would form a link between the developed area and the heathland as this would defeat the object of diverting the recreational use away from the heathland. Part of LPR REG 18 8 actually Ferndown Common, and much more falls within the 400 metre zone where development would be contrary to the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD. It also abuts Big Copse SNCI, an important area of old woodland and wet heathland/ acid mire habitats being managed for wildlife. This site is an important supporting habitat to the adjacent Ferndown Common international site. Further built development in this area would not only add to the pressures on the heathland but would increase its isolation within a surrounding built environment, decreasing any opportunities for ecological linkages, and would therefore be contrary to NPPF para 170 and to Policy 4.1 of this Local Plan. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**
- Objection to the potential development options (LPR-REG 18-8, LPR-REG, 18-8 8-162, LPR-REG 18-66). Any development at these locations would negatively affect the adjacent Ferndown Common SSSI, e.g. via increased public pressure, and increasing incidents of serious heath fires which are damaging protected habitats and species, and threatening neighbouring properties. These proposals are in contradiction to the Objectives and other policies in the Plan. **(Amphibians and Reptiles Conservation Trust)**
- Concerns with impact of development on Ferndown Common. Maximise development near to built-up areas. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Objections regarding:
  - o Use of SSSI as a shortcut to Ferndown,
  - o Wildlife impacts
  - o Potential noise impacts from the nearby farm
  - o Traffic congestions issues
  - o Damage to farm land
  - o Impact on the character of the area
  - o Services and facilities at peak capacity
  - o Enviromental and safety impacts of development close to Longham Lakes
  - o Impact on gravel reserves
  - o Extra traffic from displaced horses
  - o Location of the site in relation to Ferndown Common

### Dudsbury Golf Course

- There seems to be a good package of avoidance and mitigation measures, and existing features. A SANG masterplan is required to confirm that there will be SANG areas that do not flood. A linking bridge over the Stour could be provided and Natural England has welcomed this proposal as there are substantial areas of greenspace on the southern side.

Biodiversity assessment of the site is needed. Potentially a low-risk allocation due to limited impacts, and potential gains. **(Natural England)**

- A large part of the proposed allocation falls within Flood Zone 3, which should not be built on. A substantial area should be allocated for a SANG, to contribute to the proposed Stour Valley Nature Park. Some of the SANG should be outside of the flood zone so that it is accessible at all times of the year. Considerable landscape and habitat restoration work will be necessary and the SANG itself should be screened from the development e.g. by native woodland and hedgerow planting. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**
- Substantial SANG linking to the Stour Valley Nature Park is required, allowing access all year round with pathways/cycleways that do not flood. Significant landscape and habitat restoration should be conditioned with details agreed by the Council in consultation with Natural England and the Dorset Wildlife Trust. It may be possible for this to include some of the water attenuation requirements, enhancing existing stream corridors and ponds. The development will be in a prominent position and should be screened from the SANG through careful landscaping and native tree and hedgerow planting. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- Particular attention should be paid to ensuring full compliance with the policy on external lighting. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- The integrity and setting of the hillfort to the East should be safeguarded. The green belt gaps between Parley, Longham and Ferndown should be retained. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- In principle the allocation would be suitable, being able to take a proper account of the Dudsbury hillfort's elevated setting, the Grade II listed church at Longham and their presence in the landscape. Any future allocation should ensure that key heritage issues and strategic design suggestions made by Historic England are included. **(Historic England)**
- Dudsbury Golf Course could offer opportunity to provide links to the Stour Valley Nature Park and would potentially offer scope for extensive habitat restoration. **(RSPB)**
- Objections to the loss of the Golf Course unless it is demonstrated that it is surplus to requirements. This would need the developer to work with England Golf to establish this is the case. Updated strategy required in order to seek contributions. **(Sport England)**
- General objections regarding
  - o Traffic congestion
  - o Requirement of a new golf course
  - o Impact on the beauty of the environment
  - o Poor infrastructure in the area not being able to support the development

## Longham

- General objections regarding:
  - o Insufficient infrastructure and facilities
  - o Flooding
  - o Impact on wildlife, at Longham lakes
  - o Loss of Green Belt
  - o Overdevelopment
  - o Traffic congestion and highway safety
  - o Impact on village character

- Impact on family homes
- Air pollution from traffic
- Lack of public transport
- Support for the extension of the village envelope to include Haskins Garden Centre.
- Contradiction with objective 3 of the plan review
- Area requires middle/upper school not lower school

## Transport

- Allocations individually could not support strategic bus service development or enhancement, but together there could be potential to connect to the same nodes. Proposal of a pooled contribution towards improvements of the X6 connecting to Bournemouth and Poole, potentially there is merit in pooling developer contributions collectively from all sites to deliver service enhancements. Suggestion to amend supporting text to include contributions towards enhancements to bus service X6. **(Go South Coast)**
- Objections regarding:
  - road infrastructure and the need for improvements prior to development.
  - Highway safety
  - Lack of public transport or cycle tracks
  - Lack of rail links

## Ecology

- The Holmwood House SANG has no agreed level of spare capacity. **(Natural England)**
  - Concerns regarding wildlife impacts

## Infrastructure

- West Parley and Longham Palmersford STW has significant treatment headroom to accommodate these proposed developments. **(Wessex Water)**
- Policies should be re-ordered so that they are consequential. Requirement for inclusion of more high level cycling network and route diagrams to reduce car use. Increase mentions of other public transport modes. **(Transport Planning Bournemouth Borough Council)**
- Objections regarding:
  - Loss of green spaces
  - Capacity of utilities
  - Limited existing infrastructure – health provision, education

## Environment

- Further information and plans required to detail the proposed allocations in terms of access, flooding, and heritage constraints; in relation to the Hill Fort and for Dudsbury Golf Course. Regard should be had to previous Planning Inspectorate observations regarding number of houses on the Cala Homes Site. **(West Parley Parish Council)**
- Objections regarding:
  - Loss of Green Belt, urban sprawl and protection of Green Belt
  - Impact on village character and community feel
  - Loss of green spaces
  - Noise and air pollution
  - Impacts on amenity

- Flooding impacts

## Other

- Housing potential of the area has been overestimated due potential double counting
- The Plan would need to be updated in line with the revised NPPF.
- A new settlement may be the solution.
- Objections regarding:
  - Investment in the town centre is required
  - Affordability of houses
  - Homes being bought as second homes

### Draft Policy 5.10 - Holmwood House New Neighbourhood, Ferndown

- Concerns with impact of development on Ferndown Common. Maximise development near to built-up areas. **(Dorset CPRE)**

### Draft Policy 5.11 - East of New Road New Neighbourhood, West Parley

- Support for the policy. The SANG lies to the East. There must be very safe crossings for families and children living to the West of what will be a very busy link road. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Support for policy subject to amendments. Bus route improvements may not be necessary or viable. Should not presume that we would be able to provide any route diversion or other service enhancement on a commercial basis. Therefore it seems reasonable that a development of this size should kick-start the service enhancement with the operator taking the commercial risk after the kick start period. Recommendation the route remains on the current routing with decent footways through the site to connect to bus stops with the majority of dwellings within or around the 300 metre guideline for such development. **(Go South Coast)**

### Draft Policy 5.12 - West of New Road, New Neighbourhood, West Parley

- Some information has been provided at Longham (Policy 5.12) which would, subject to other, matters be likely to allow a suitable mitigation package to be developed although not for all of the currently identified land to be developed. **(Natural England)**
- Highlighted importance of road crossings. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Agreement with the transport and access suggested wording and the phasing requirement. **(Transport Planning Bournemouth Borough Council)**
- To ensure sustainable development is achieved, the positive scheme presented for Examination and subsequently adopted in the Core Strategy (policy FWP7) should not be significantly watered down. Great weight should be given to the Hill Fort's conservation. **(Historic England)**
- Any development should provide links to the Stour Valley Nature Park, and part of the site as shown in map 5.2.2.6 should continue to be allocated as a SANG. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**
- Concerns regarding impact on the Hill Fort, which are not acknowledged in the policy.

### Draft Policy 5.13 - Residential development proposal at Green Worlds

- Requirement for safe road crossings for elderly residents. Question of where the nearest SANG is located. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Recommendation for a tree buffer and green infrastructure. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**

- A SANG would need to be delivered, and biodiversity surveys of the site undertaken. **(Natural England)**
- Support for the policy on public transport terms. The allocation lies close to service X6 providing hourly connections to Ringwood, Ferndown, Bournemouth and Poole. **(Go South Coast)**

### 5.2.3 Open Space

- Sport England strongly objects to this policy as it is based on out of date evidence and is contrary the NPPF paragraph 96. Notwithstanding this, standards are not acceptable when dealing with sports provision. To overcome our objection, an open space strategy a Playing Pitch strategy and built facilities strategy should be prepared to inform the open space and sports requirements within the borough. **(Sport England)**

### 5.2.4 Town, District & Local Centres

#### *General Comments*

- Objection to West Parley becoming a retail centre. **(West Parley Parish Council)**
- There is scope for improving the town centre, having more local owned shops and services in Ferndown

#### Draft Policy 5.16 - West Parley Enhancement Scheme

- Support for the policy, subject to amendments to include signal priority for buses to improve connectivity for bus users and this to be explicit in the policy. **(Go South Coast)**
- We agree that the policy text is clear and precise but recommend the removal of Map 5.2.4.3. This illustration is particularly prescriptive when the scheme is likely to change as a result of the scheme development process, and also the SEDMMTS refresh. **(Transport Planning Bournemouth Borough Council)**
- Concerns over increased traffic congestion. Suggestion to improve infrastructure first.

#### Draft Policy 5.18

- There is biodiversity interest in the SNCI, acid grasslands and heathland/wetland areas which are largely neglected. The area should be resurveyed to allow a realistic understanding of biodiversity constraints and the likely developable area. Suggestion that that the final bullet point in Policy 5.18 should list acid grassland and wet woodland habitats as well as heathland. **(Natural England)**
- Foul flows will be directed to Kinson STW, which is likely to be able to accommodate development. **(Wessex Water)**

## 5.3 Verwood, St Leonards, St Ives & West Moors

### 5.3.1 Introduction

- Sports should be included within bullet point 2 of 5.3.1.1. **(Sports England)**

### 5.3.2 Housing

#### Draft Policy 5.19 Verwood Housing Option

- Support for policy. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- No objection to housing options however concerns regarding lack of transport modelling and comment around affordable housing being a minimum figure and not an 'up to' figure. **(West Moors Parish Council)**

- Notes importance of including allocated developments in SRN transport modelling and Highways England input prior to sites being allocated. **(Highways England)**
- A SANG and enhancements to the nearby Potterne Park area have been agreed which will provide sufficient mitigation. The authority should consider whether the policy should be extended to cover provision of a safe crossing point at Potterne Hill LNR to facilitate public access. **(Natural England)**
- Great care needs to be taken to avoid any harm to the Moors River SSSI or increase in flood risk which may also affect it. It is a difficult area to build in. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Specific areas that are likely to require special protection from informal recreational pressure are the Moors River SSSI, the area of woodland at the northern end and the ancient boundary bank bordering the West Moors Plantation. Wet or seasonally wet woodland and grassland habitats on the site, including the mapped potential ecological network, should be retained and be protected from trampling, so development should be restricted to the improved grassland at the SW end of the site. Recommendation for tree and hedgerow planting along the southern boundary to reduce air and noise pollution from traffic on the A31. Suggestion of wildlife strategy to ensure biodiversity net gain and no harm to the Moors River SSSI and adjacent areas. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- Particular regard to the water environment, including river corridor restoration, flood attenuation and water quality improvements will be needed and in this respect the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to mitigate any potential impacts will be expected to form part of the strategy.' **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- The prerequisites for development should deliver biodiversity enhancement not simply ensure no harm to designated sites EDEP recommends that all sites that impact on Crane/Moors River SSSI should include conditions requiring implementation of the NE/EA draft restoration plan for those stretches. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- Land south of Manor Road - site lies adjacent to Potterne Hill SNCI and Local Nature Reserve, and site must be protected from development. A substantial buffer between housing and SNCI is required and additional contributions required towards the management and maintenance of the SNCI. The southern area falls within the flood zone 3 and so cannot be built on. Planning conditions required to ensure no impact on Crane SSSI. Development within the catchment of the River Crane / Moors River should contribute to habitat enhancement along these rivers. Any permission should require the implementation of the NE/EA draft restoration plan. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**
- Detailed information is required to assess the existing habitat interest of this area particularly given the suitability of habitat for foraging Nightjar associated with nearby heathland sites and more generally for wildlife utilising the river corridor. The RSPB would expect that any development permitted here would be accompanied by adequate measures to protect and enhance the river valley habitat. **(RSPB)**
- Support for site land south of manor road, location is sustainable but public transport improvements required. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Support for development to west of Edmondsham Road and Verwood in general to make plan sound
- Support for development south of Manor Road
- Support for policy 5.19



- Concern around soundness of the policy and lack of consideration of sites outside of the Green Belt first
- Comments surrounding lack of consultation on proposed amendments to Green Belt boundaries

#### Draft Policy 5.20 West Moors Housing Option

- The north of Azalea roundabout boundaries appear to overlap with areas designated within the Moors River System SSSI. Loss of these areas to development would be considered unacceptable. The RSPB would expect that development at this location outside of protected areas would be accompanied by adequate measures to protect and enhance the river valley habitat. **(RSPB)**
- Highways England will have concerns regarding potential impact on A31 and comments questioning how it is accessed. Traffic modelling outcome is required however the site lies in a generally sustainable location with some local services, facilities, employment and education. Bus service improvements required and provision of cycle and pedestrian links. **(Dorset County Council)**
- Support for inclusion of land at West Moors in plan and promotion of land at West Moors site
- Objection to section 5.3.2.21 as built facilities and playing pitch strategy is outdated. **(Sports England)**
- Policy 5.20 Natural England has engaged with the promoter and a SANG design is agreed for the allocation north of the A31. The area to the south is not known to Natural England and no assessment of biodiversity value is available. **(Natural England)**

#### Draft Policy 5.21 North West Verwood New Neighbourhood

- Trinity school- the green belt boundary should be moved to allow school to develop. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Support. **(Dorset CPRE)**

#### Draft Policy 5.22 North East Verwood New Neighbourhood

- No further comments to add. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Support. **(Dorset CPRE)**

#### 5.3.3 Open Space

- No specific comments received

#### 5.3.4 Town, District & Local Centres

##### Draft Policy 5.23 Verwood Town Centre

- Support. **(Dorset CPRE)**

##### Draft Policy 5.24 West Moors District Centre

- Support. **(Dorset CPRE)**

### 5.3.5 Community Facilities & Services

#### Draft Policy 5.25 Extension to West Moors Library

#### Draft Policy 5.26 South of Howe Lane Education Allocation, Verwood

- Support for building South of Howe Lane Education Allocation as soon as possible. **(Dorset CPRE)**

#### Draft Policy 5.27 Matchams Stadium and House

- Could make reference to extant permissions and need for sustainable proposals in this location. **(Natural England)**
- Support for principle of policy but suggested alterations to phrase 'marked increase in vehicular traffic' is suggestive and open to interpretation. Suggested rewording to: The Council will continue to support improvements to facilities at Matchams Stadium provided an increase of more than 30% of the current attendance at events would not be permitted. Also Sport England would expect the facilities to be relocated and operational prior to the existing site being redeveloped. **(Sport England)**
- Comments surrounding promotion of the site at Matchams Stadium for a care village
- Settlement hierarchy obstructs delivery at Matchams
- Could make reference to extant permissions and need for sustainable proposals in this location
- Support for redevelopment – should be removed Matchams Stadium site from the Green Belt; and allocate for Care Village
- Support for policy - it will facilitate restoration of the environment surrounding the site
- The policy should more positively promote the site and its removal from the Green Belt. Recommendation to redraft as formal allocation with allocated use as a care village and removal from the Green Belt to facilitate beneficial development. Modify text: 'result in a marked increase in vehicular traffic attending the site, and the heathlands are positively managed to prevent their deterioration and the openness of the Green Belt is not diminished. Any proposal for alternative use or redevelopment would be subject to Green Belt policy and the prior submission of plans for the restoration and management of the heathland, prepared in conjunction with English Nature Natural England and other appropriate bodies.'
- Queries why St Leonards hospital is closing if the plan is to increase health services- this should be kept open and expanded
- The plan does not allocate any land within West Moors for C2 care facilities, despite the recognition within page 17 that a significant elderly and retired population will require appropriate housing, health care and community facilities. Although draft policy 4.20 confirms that C2 developments will not be subject to affordable housing contributions and that they will be permitted as long as the objectives of Dorset County Council are not compromised, the plan makes no provision for the development of such facilities "this is left solely to the private sector to find a suitable site and make an appropriate planning case at the appropriate time". Objection to the plan because the plan does not allocate any land within the West Moors district for much needed C2 care facilities.

#### Additional sites promoted:

- recommend allocating land west of Brockwood and Oaks Drive in St Leonards for housing and care home. Revision to housing target is necessary to accord with revised NPPF methodology

- suggestion of inclusion of Potterne Hill dairy within consultation
- land adjacent to Green Acre, Manor Road
- land south of Manor Road
- land to the south of Gulliver's Farm, and comments about how the sustainability of this site is higher than many other sites being brought forward, including some in the greenbelt. This site should be considered before removing land from the greenbelt to ensure the plan is found sound
- promotion of 25 acres of urban fringe land located east and south of West Moors Road and north of Sarum Avenue

## 5.4 Rural settlements in East Dorset

### 5.4.1 Introduction

- Highways England will wait for transport modelling to become available before commenting on site allocations in the East Dorset rural settlements. The modelling being undertaken should include assessment of any SRN impact seen as a result of the allocated developments. Highways England will check inputs and results and impacts on SRN however it is unlikely that these will have a material impact on the operation of the SRN. It is likely that the majority of trips generated by proposals for allocated developments in these areas will have destinations within the surrounding local area and will therefore impact primarily on the local road network.

#### **(Highways England)**

### 5.4.2 Alderholt

#### Draft Policy 5.28 Housing options – Alderholt

##### *Comments of support*

Some general comments of support were received which were summarised as follows:

- Support for village envelope infill map 5.4.2.4. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**
- Support for plan
- Support for major development at Alderholt
- Objection to relying on smaller settlements to meet housing demand
- Support for 150 dwellings
- Support for infill and extension to village envelope which provides certainty
- Support for a smaller development

##### *Summary of objections*

Comments of objection can be categorised by the following which the below sections provide more detail on:

- Insufficient transport and road infrastructure
- General lack of services and facilities concerns
- Environmental and habitat concerns
- Impact on village character
- Flooding
- Option is not sustainable
- Lack of employment
- Concerns regarding population increase
- Viability
- Green Belt

- Impacts on New Forest

#### *General objection to large scale development*

- Alderholt policy is unsound due to its location and accessibility; unsustainable with regards to provision of services and inappropriate as it would completely change the character and nature of this rural community. **(Fordingbridge Town Council)**
- Development does not comply with objective 6 - it is not the 'most accessible locations'. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**
- Objection to rural village becoming a small town. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**
- Many other locations are much more suitable
- Suggestion that 16 homes to meet the 6-7% growth (as similar to other settlements in the plan) over the village could be met on the land behind the school currently used by AYS Skips that is not green belt, is not biodiverse and doesn't flood
- There is limited capacity for growth
- No further development should be considered until existing permissions have been completed
- Alderholt has been overburdened with large scale housing
- Will cause property values in Alderholt to drop
- Reference to analysis done by David Tooke explaining why the proposed development would not comply with many other policies within the plan
- The village cannot cope with this amount of growth
- Alderholt is not suitable for such a large scale development
- Objection to large scale development but support for creation of a Community Land Trust for development
- Amount of dwellings should be reduced to allow a more natural growth of facilities alongside development of the village
- Objection to development on grounds of lack of access/space for vehicles and traffic and congestion issues
- Objection to building on grade 3 farmland

#### *Concerns over infrastructure and transport*

- Doubts that developer contributions will provide suitable infrastructure and this will take years to implement, leaving residents with inadequate services. Road infrastructure is woefully inadequate already by way of capacity and access along all 4 routes which are narrow twisting lanes "only C grade roads except for the B3078 from Fordingbridge to Cranborne which links to the A338. Particular points of note are the bridge at Alderholt Mill on Sandleheath Road, Pressey's Corner in Alderholt, the narrowing of Bowerwood Road towards Fordingbridge, and the continuing dangerous degradation of the Somerley Road due to the gravel and infill lorries. There is no simple solution without huge cost, to address this. All roads except for the B3078 to Cranborne are under Hampshire County Council and the main route to Salisbury via Sandleheath, fall under Wiltshire County Council. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**
- Concerns that building proposed 820 dwellings at Fordingbridge will already impact roads for Alderholt residents. Many of the services provided to Alderholt residents, such as health and education is across the border in Fordingbridge, Hampshire. This requires cross boundary working and to date there is no evidence that supports this will be provided or that the needs of Alderholt residents will be prioritised. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**
- At Alderholt road infrastructure issues are in direct conflict with the wording of policy 3.12 and the transport strategy in the document only focuses on the main transport corridors and their improvement. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**

- Query how development proposals tie in with Policy 3.12 on sustainable transport. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Objection to development unless there is a determination to provide a good public transport system, even if it has to be subsidised. It must be fit for purpose and provide a service for workers and those wishing to get to the larger retail centres. Some research would be required to ascertain the best routes and what centres. It would also be preferable if an Upper School existed in Verwood so they would not have to be transported too far. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Lack of public transport - Alderholt and adjacent Parish Councils have funded for this year only the DCT 97 bus on a reduced three morning a week service. The presumption of no public transport necessitates a greater dependence upon the car resulting in increased pollution and need for car parking spaces. Isolation for those without access to a car and with no public transport is an issue where it impacts adversely on our most vulnerable residents wellbeing. There is a total lack of any provision for business use which therefore determines that Alderholt will indeed be a dormitory village where everyone needs a vehicle and will be commuting into and out of the village. 1,000 properties equates to at least 2000 additional vehicles. Leisure facilities are already limited in Alderholt. Costs of providing improved facilities to accommodate a doubling of population are likely to far exceed the developer's contributions. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**
- Narrow roads leading to and from Alderholt are a particular problem, making it unsafe for pedestrians (few pavements and none to the first school) and cycling: in places it is difficult for cars and HGVs to pass each other. Significant improvement to roads is an essential prerequisite but without creating a rat run through the village as a result of induced traffic. It will be essential to work with neighbouring councils as well as the Highways Authority to find a solution before considering further development. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- Objections to small or large development on transport grounds. Transport modelling required. Potential to use disused railway line as a cycle link. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Object to this policy as is not accessible by public transport and the development is therefore unsustainable and contrary to Draft Policy 3.12. These sites are not served by public transport and small in nature. Accordingly they are not sustainable. **(Go South Coast)**
- Objection to 1000 dwellings at Alderholt as Fordingbridge would not be able to sustain this level of development. Requirement for South East Dorset Multi Modal Transport Study update. **(Hampshire County Council)**
- The location of Alderholt makes it inaccessible without travel through narrow country lanes (designed for horses and carts) and onward it will be necessary to pass through the already problematic town centre of Fordingbridge. All of the roads into and out of the village, are unsuitable for a significant increase in the volume of traffic from construction or residents. Will be a massive increase in school transport provision- more buses on narrow country lanes. Lorries and large delivery vans already create a danger making deliveries and using this as a cut-through to the A338 or to avoid the A31 to Southampton. Unless a direct link to the A338 by way of provision of a bypass (in itself not acceptable) any potential improvements to the immediate transport network, particularly into Fordingbridge will do nothing to improve or prevent an increase in the issues faced in the Town Centre. Furthermore an increase in traffic travelling onwards to Southampton via Godshill, the open forest and onto Cadnam will significantly impact on both the character, environment and inhabitants (animals and human) of this protected, tranquil place. **(Fordingbridge Town Council)**
- With regard to public transport, it is difficult to see how Alderholt could be linked to the mainstream public transport network giving access to Ringwood, Bournemouth and Salisbury. The Public Community Bus service (no. 97) is already under threat with requests for funding and

even if continued, cannot be considered to provide an adequate alternative to car use.

**(Fordingbridge Town Council)**

- The requirements of Policy 3.12 cannot be met in the allocation draft policy 5.28 making it unsound. Concerns that transport modelling will be completed too late and should consider duty to cooperate and impact of neighbouring New Forest DC Local Plan. The improvements are planned on the A31 around Ringwood, will not alleviate the problems on the A31 and the M27 the solution - dual carriage across the A31 forest route, at what cost to the environment and this would only create further problems to the west at Wimborne. The impact will be that more commuters will use the B3078 across the more sensitive part of the forest. **(Fordingbridge Town Council)**
- Given the difficulties explained above regarding public transport, the majority of working residents will rely on travelling to work by car. This reliance can only exacerbate the traffic problems. While opportunities for employment may be present in Fordingbridge, there are no plans to provide sufficient parking spaces within the town centre to cope with an increase in demand, particularly for long-stay spaces for either residents or workers. **(Fordingbridge Town Council)**
- Alderholt development is contrary to the sustainable patterns of development that draft policy 3.12 tries to create. This money would not necessarily be used locally, and being paid to Dorset would not help Hampshire to improve the road network. Alderholt has very limited public transport, currently funded in large part by the Parish Council. The road network is strained carrying the current traffic load. Doubling that load would be wholly impractical without extensive upgrades to the roads out of the village, and provision of footpaths along these roads which would be required for access to the new developments. Indeed any development, even far short of 1,000 houses, would require improvements to be made in the transport network and the provision of footpaths to link such new housing to the village centre. Suggestion that Draft Policy 3.12 precludes Alderholt being selected for such an extensive development.
- Alderholt's proposed development also does not comply with Policy 3.14 as it has very poor public transport, and facilities for cycling and walking- narrow country roads mean this is potentially hazardous. Any CIL Payments by developers building in Alderholt may well not be used in the village, since the funds go into a central pot.
- Current infrastructure would poorly serve the new development
- Traffic is bad and roads are at capacity
- concerns over the bridge at the far end of the village which is at capacity – should have traffic lights installed at either side
- Newton Road is a narrow country lane with no street-lights, pavements or traffic calming- high speed traffic is already an issue for accessing properties
- No bus service and no cycle lanes/footpaths to access Fordingbridge/ Verwood/ Ringwood. If buses were using the current roads there is not sufficient width at several points to allow more than one way traffic.
- Traffic lights or road widening required before any increase in housing and instigation of a bus service.
- Cycle paths will be required if there is an increase in traffic. The roads are dangerous even for fit, strong, confident adult cyclists. Children and non-recreational cyclists will not feel inclined to use the roads outside of the village.
- Policy should be renewed in terms of the ability to provide infrastructure and housing numbers reduced

## Housing

- Affordable housing 30-50% is unviable
- Affordable housing won't be available for locals
- More affordable housing is needed
- Recognises the need for affordable housing however it is not needed in a place like Alderholt where there are no services or entertainment
- Concerns that the houses would all be large and not affordable and bought by people who can afford to drive elsewhere
- 50% affordable housing is too much
- There is not the demand for this amount of affordable housing in the area

## Concerns over lack of facilities and services:

### Reliance on the provision of services from neighbouring larger settlements

- local services are already inadequate and with the combined impact of the proposed new development in Fordingbridge (800 dwellings) services will not cope

### Schools and lack of recreational services for young people

- There is first school provision in Alderholt at St James First School and it is unknown whether the existing site will be able to expand to accommodate the inevitable rise in pupil numbers. Currently, older children travel to Cranborne Middle School and Queen Elizabeth School in Wimborne, or schools in Fordingbridge. An Upper School at Verwood has been talked about for many years but has still not been provided despite the ever growing population in Verwood. There is no guarantee that increased dwellings in Alderholt will result in this being built. With Burgate School, Fordingbridge already having to cope with the additional housing programmed there and QE at Wimborne also full, development of this size in Alderholt could lead to totally inadequate education provision for Alderholt. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**
- With regard to education, within the village there is only one public sector school, St James First School. There are no Upper or Middle Schools, with the nearest schools located at Cranborne, Verwood and Wimborne. **(Fordingbridge Town Council)**
- Any increase in demand for education should be met within the settlement to reduce the impact on the transport network however this is potentially unrealistic and unviable. The current Upper School provision is located in Wimborne, at a considerable distance from Alderholt. The most local school, Burgate in Fordingbridge which takes pupils from outside of catchment may have to review this position to manage the increase in demand following the proposed new development in Fordingbridge. **(Fordingbridge Town Council)**
- Concerns that sports facilities will not come forwards despite the recognised need for additional pitches
- Development is likely to appeal to people moving and retiring to the area and not young people

### Shops

- Residents will through necessity need to travel to neighbouring settlements for shopping
- If shops were in Alderholt, lorries would be clogging up the country roads

### Medical infrastructure is currently insufficient

- A new surgery is needed, or at least a pharmacy. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**

### Broadband

- Broadband is poor and buffers, any further drop in service would make it impossible to work from home. Everyone will have to leave the village to work but there are very few jobs in the area.

### Utilities

- There is no gas available beyond the existing village envelope, the water pressure is currently very poor in some village locations even after previous works, and there would be a need to provide adequate sewerage. The existing Broadband and mobile signal provision is also patchy. A doubling of the village population could result in deterioration of the existing utilities. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**
- STW have some capacity but additional capacity will be required in the medium to long term. **(Wessex Water)**
- Potential sewage and drainage issues

### Lack of employment

- There is no specific proposal to provide new employment opportunities within Alderholt and while there may be the potential for some provision, this has to be regarded as limited.

### Village centre

- The villages and outlying hamlets and houses are also currently well served by the larger towns immediately adjacent to Alderholt - Fordingbridge, Verwood and even Ringwood. Even as a designated Rural Service Centre, Alderholt is not, and will not be, in a position to compete with them.

### CIL payments and contributions

- Payments may not go towards infrastructure and service provision at Alderholt

### Safety issues

- We are led to believe that the fire engine provision at both Fordingbridge and Cranborne is on a retained basis only. The proposed expansion of housing in Fordingbridge circa 820 plus and a minimum of 1000 at Alderholt will add ever increasing strains on these services with no guarantees of improved provision. **(Alderholt Parish Council)**

### Sustainability concerns:

- Sustainability of this amount of people relying on cars living in this rural area and impacts on facilities and services
- Lack of consideration for the climate crisis

### Flooding concerns:

- Request for the inclusion of Flood Risk. On the east of the site there is a limited capacity culvert under the railway. The impact of the culvert and ordinary watercourses must be considered. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- The rivers are at capacity yearly
- Building on flood plains extenuates this risk
- The building of more houses will add to the run off into the already boggy areas surrounding the village. No more hard surfaces required! Flooding already an issue at the edges of the village, pushing more surface water onto the surrounding land cannot be good.

### Erosion of village character

- The village is currently classed as a Rural Settlement and as such is located in the centre of a mainly agricultural environment. The settlement still maintains its village character with provision for essential requirements supplied by the central convenience store, sport and recreation provision at the recreation ground, leisure activities, (walking, cycling and horse-riding) and has managed to retain the public house social facility. The proposed development will double the population and built environment, potentially turning the village into a dormitory settlement in a similar fashion to that of neighbouring Verwood. **(Fordingbridge Town Council)**



- Desire to remain as a village and do not want to become a town
- Would be a dormitory town

#### *Environment and biodiversity concerns*

- Impact on heathlands- all housing options proposed to the west of Alderholt lie just outside of the 400m buffer associated with Cranborne Common SSSI, part of the Dorset Heathlands SPA/Dorset Heaths SAC. An existing bridal way provides public access via Blackwater Grove onto protected heathland areas. It is therefore considered likely that increased recreation as a result of large scale housing at this location would be difficult to deflect from protected areas by SANG provision. **(RSPB)**
- The village infilling policy boundary should exclude SNCIs. Objection to development of sites that are or include SNCIs. There should be a buffer between any development and SNCIs. It appears that a centrally located SANG could be delivered by up to five land owners working together. It is essential that a mechanism is found that avoids some developers holding others to ransom because of SANG delivery as happened with a housing allocation in Verwood. EDEP strongly supports the Parish Council request for a detailed growth plan to be drawn up before the Local Plan is submitted to the Secretary of State. Current concerns include few buses other than those for schooling, safe access to the small first school, very limited medical provision. We must not end up with a piecemeal approach and infrastructure long after development (as in Verwood where it took decades to deliver key infrastructure). We suggest that the local employment area should be identified at the pre-submission stage. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**
- A small part of the Village Infill Policy Envelope map overlaps the boundary of an SNCI, (SU 11/016) and the Infill Envelope boundary should therefore be amended. DWT objects to any development which would be on an SNCI including LP2SC56 and LP2SC51 overlap the boundary of an SNCI (SU11/016 Daggons Road Station). Development within LP REG 18 129 and LP REG 18 - 174 would require a substantial buffer to the SNCIs and appropriate mitigation measures. Previous information suggests that LP2SC36 is grassland of high ecological quality with wildlife interest and therefore DWT would recommend that without further detailed survey this area is not taken forward. A SANG would need to be deliverable which was sufficiently large to accommodate the large number of proposed houses. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**
- The area to the east of the settlement is the most sensitive area as there is ready access to the designated sites; users could here be diverted with a SANG rather than residential development as priority. The FC land to the south offers potential for mitigation as part of a package of measures including new SANG. **(Natural England)**
- Development would connect to Fordingbridge sewage treatment works, which discharges into the Hampshire Avon river- this would have potential impacts on the River Avon SAC and must be phosphate neutral. **(Environment Agency)**
- Requirement for SANGs would take away from CIL funds
- SANG of the required scale would not be achievable
- Map 5.4.2.1 - land within 400m heathland buffer and sites of nature conservation should be excluded from area of search on map
- The area of search should exclude the 400m heathland buffer

#### *Impacts on the New Forest*

- Transport modelling must factor in impacts on the New Forest. Unfenced B-roads, such as the B3078, cross internationally protected habitats at high risk of animal accidents. Increased traffic on the B3078 also detrimentally impacts local New Forest communities along the route. As a

minimum, the East Dorset Local Plan should require future development in Alderholt to contribute towards funding of traffic management measures on affected rural roads in Hampshire to mitigate the impact of development. The Authority also endorses the points raised by New Forest District Council regarding the potential air quality impacts on the New Forest's Natura 2000 sites from the scale of development proposed in Alderholt and the increased traffic this would generate. Traffic-based air quality assessment work was undertaken in 2017/18 for the New Forest. It is not clear from the published Habitats Regulations Assessment information whether your Local Plan review has assessed potential impacts on the New Forest Natura 2000 sites from the development proposed. **(Planning Policy New Forest National Park Authority)**

#### *Promotion of further sites:*

- Land adjacent to Sandcroft, Daggons Road
- Land at Daggons Road, Alderholt, SP6 3DL
- Land at Blackwater Grove, Alderholt, SP6 3AD
- Land off Brickyard Lane, Verwood, BH31 7LG
- Land north of Daggon's Road
- Land at Alderholt Nursery
- Land east of Hillbury Road

### 5.4.3 Cranborne

#### Draft Policy 5.29 Housing options – Cranborne

- Priority should be for affordable housing. There is also a concern that the location of development should not restrict the school or the Ancient Technology Centre so development should be to the east of Boveridge Road. Requirement for a specific statement in the policy to ensure that heritage issues are taken into account when development is being considered. A contribution to AONB purposes seems much more relevant than a contribution towards heathland mitigation. The potential extension eastwards of the village infill envelope would noticeably extend the built up area of the village which would be apparent from public Rights of Way as well as the highway. **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Allocations will have minimal impact on highway network but will be largely car-dependent. Education contributions required across all three phases. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Confirmation that the STW are able to handle the proposed development. **(Wessex Water)**
- Support for allocations north of Grugs Lane and north of Penny's Lane
- Object to policy 5.29 regarding 50% affordable housing - should be site specific and negotiable
- Various objections to Grugs Lane development on the following grounds:
  - o concerns over changing the village character and changing the village skyline
  - o biodiversity concerns especially with removal of hedgerow
  - o flooding and water run-off from fields
  - o conservation concerns
  - o potential for overlooking and dominating neighbouring properties
  - o concern with moving allotments
  - o traffic concerns
  - o previous planning refusal in the location
- Objection to development north of penny's lane on the following grounds:

- erosion of rural feel
- impacts of views of dwellings changing the character of the village
- impacts on the character of the conservation area- this contradicts policy 4.26 as it would have an impact on the conservation area and a contradiction with the planning history of the site
- General objections to the policy on the following grounds:
  - Objections due to lack of infrastructure, removal of green belt and dwindling activities for young people.

#### Draft Policy 5.30 Land at the Former Sawmill, Cranborne

- Agree with site allocation. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Land should not only be used for employment, promotion of the site for mixed use development
- Support for mini industrial estate on the old Sawmill – it is a good idea. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Pollution from any timber treatment at the former sawmills may be an issue. This should be investigated and remedial measures taken if appropriate. Development should deliver biodiversity enhancement not simply ensure no harm to the River Crane, SSSI. EDEP recommends that all sites that impact on Crane/Moors River SSSI should include conditions requiring implementation of the NE/EA draft restoration plan for those stretches. Particular regard to the water environment, including river corridor restoration, flood attenuation and water quality improvements will be needed and in this respect the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to mitigate any potential impacts will be expected to form part of the strategy. **(East Dorset Environment Partnership)**

#### 5.4.4 Edmondsham

##### Draft Policy 5.31 Housing options for Edmondsham

- the village is within the AONB and the Green Belt. Edmondsham tends to focus on the chalk downlands and therefore if development is permitted a contribution to AONB purposes seems much more relevant than a contribution towards heathland mitigation. Furthermore the Edmondsham village infill policy envelope map 5.4.4.4 includes a significant extension south westwards that is not identified as a potential site in the area discussions and plans in the section. The infill policy envelope does, therefore, appear rather arbitrary rather than logical. **(Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Definitions of the sites need slight correction and/or clarification. Two Sites in what you describe as Sandys Hill road. Its correct historical name is Station Road, since it used to be the way to Verwood Station. The site nearest to Edmondsham House could provide 1 unit of housing, and be connected to the drainage Septic Tank serving the existing houses. The southerly site might need a separate Septic Tank, and accommodate 1 unit, as well as additional parking for residents in Station Road who would lose the area between Nos. 8 and 9 should that be developed. The Site described as north of Orchard Close, I think, should be changed to "north of The Old Post Office". There is no possible access to land north of Orchard Close. There is, however, very good access to the land north of the Old Post Office. This is a suitable site easy to connect to the existing drainage system and has room on the plot for 2 or 3 residential units, small enough to be Affordable Housing. Land at Upper Farm. This is misleading. Rather than any new development, it is intended that, when the time is right, some of the redundant Farm buildings could be adapted to allow for 4 residential units to be provided. I realise that only 7

units have been allocated for Edmondsham on the Local Plan. However, I wonder whether, since the Farm buildings would not alter the landscape in any way, an additional 2 units could be added, located at Upper Farm. **(Edmondsham House and Gardens)**

- Minimal impact on Highway Network but will be car dependent. **(Dorset Council Council Economy)**
- Objection to southernmost part of development of sandy lane as area close to woodland SNCI. **(Dorset Wildlife Trust)**
- Two of the three sites which are being put forward as options fall within the Odour Consultation Zone of the STW in the village. However, the proposed properties do not appear to be any closer to the STW than existing property. **(Wessex Water)**

#### 5.4.5 Furzehill

##### *Comments*

- Request that there be no further additions to the village envelope and the green-belt around the envelope is fully protected. **(Furzehill Residents Association)**
- The traffic using the Furzehill road and the neighbouring lanes of Smugglers and Grange suffer from an ever increasing volume of traffic which will get significantly worse with the development of 600 houses on the Cranborne Road. Not only is the amount of traffic using the roads increasing but the size of the heavy vehicles, (road is used as a 'rat-run' to get to the A31), and the speed at which many vehicles repeatedly travel. There is no footpath and it is definitely a dangerous road for a pedestrian or cyclist. Traffic calming measures are essential, as is a weight restriction to stop the heavy lorries thundering along the narrow roads. **(Furzehill Residents Association)**
- No objection to proposed amount of new housing
- Various comments of support for redevelopment of council offices

##### *Summary of objections*

Objections received were concerned with the following points:

- The number of properties would increase by around 50% and this will have severe impacts
- Objection to loss of Green Belt land
- No further land should be included within the Furzehill Village Envelope
- Various concerns about the proposed village envelope:
  - o The additions to the Furzehill Village Envelope are not logical and do not tidy it up
  - o Proposes amendments to village envelope proposed - at the moment, the village envelope boundary seems to follow historical boundary lines which are to a large extent irrelevant and this review gives a chance to form a cohesive boundary to the settlement of Furzehill.
  - o No sensible reasons have been given for 'areas to remove'
- Concerns over roads including:
  - o Concerns over traffic and congestion which will be made worse
  - o Roads are very dangerous and further development will make this worse
  - o Suggestion of traffic calming measures
  - o Suggestion to lower speed limit along Smugglers Lane
- Flooding concerns

- Sewerage concerns
- Concerns over amount of open space
- Concerns over pollution
- Objection on the grounds of changing the character of the area

#### *Promotion of sites:*

- Promotion of land at Furzehill, suitable for around 200 homes - considered to be unconstrained with access to facilities and public transport; potential community facility and SANG.

#### **Draft Policy 5.32 Site of the Former Council Offices**

- Support for requirements as laid out in Draft 5.32 regarding any new development and the developers. Whilst the opening line of the requirements of the developer state 'must' do, in the individual requirements the word 'should' is used. We hold the council responsible to ensure the requirements are adhered to. The road through Furzehill is getting ever busier, the vehicles much larger and traffic is driving faster. There are no footpaths and it is a dangerous road for the many pedestrians that walk the road. Traffic calming measures are essential and we also request a weight restriction is added similar to the one that has been applied to the adjoining 'Smugglers Lane'. **(Furzehill Residents Association)**
- Potential impact on traffic through Middlehill Road, Colehill to A31 Canford Bottom rd, and via Cranborne Road into Wimborne. Bus service provision required and cycle/pedestrian links to Colehill and Cranborne Road to link in with the Minster Gate development. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**

#### **5.4.6 Gaunts Common**

- No specific comments were received relating to the section.

#### **5.4.7 Gussage All Saints**

- No comments on infill of settlement. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Objection to development sites on the grounds of impact on AONB and stream impact grounds - this would effectively reduce the riparian edge and significantly change the landscape character of the valley floor. That would be particularly noticeable and damaging at the south eastern end. The proposed extensions to the village envelope should therefore be reconsidered. **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Objection to policy as it is unfair and would benefit some within the village and not others.

#### **5.4.8 Gussage St Michael**

- No comments on infill of settlement. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Concerns about development changing character of the village and lane where site is proposed, and capacity of roads. **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Support for lack of development in the village but objection to proposed shape of village envelope on grounds of it being illogical and excluding the north-eastern side of the village centre
- Village envelope plan is not the updated version as prepared by Gussage St Michael Village Committee and should be amended. General support for plans for village, but extending it would add extra opportunities for the Council.

- Promotion of land at Lower Farm, Drove Cottage, 1 and 2 Pond Cottages which are in the center of the village which would be suitable for affordable housing.

#### 5.4.9 Hinton Martell

##### Draft Policy 5.33 Housing Options for Hinton Martell

###### *Comments*

- More detailed plans/proposals will be needed prior to discussion and an opportunity to comment further. If either or both of these sites were realised, the parish council would seek a blanket 20mph speed limit together with a new road surface throughout the village. **(Vale of Allen Parish Council)**
- Support for controlled growth and development of local villages and able to support allocation of the two sites at Hinton Martell. However key objectives are not met within the Hinton Martell proposal. Isolated with no amenities or public transport, mains sewer or street lighting. Village envelope has been extended beyond the limits for development and applications outside to extend this are refused. **(Vale of Allen Parish Council)**
- Objection to development here on AONB and greenbelt grounds. Development should provide AONB contribution. **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- No comments on 15 homes. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Support for suitable residential development within the village envelope
- The limits of the Hinton Martell envelope seem to have been extended beyond the existing limits for housing development. To date, any development beyond these limits has been prohibited and a number of planning applications to increase housing has been refused. The sudden availability of an enlarged envelope may well be a bitter blow for some parishioners who have had to face planning refusals on the basis of envelope limits. I understand the argument for building but this extension, convenient for council plans, may be less well-received by some.
- A quality residential development appropriately designed and landscaped to fit in with the rural feel of the village of Hinton Martell would enhance the area as a whole, leading to a community with better social and public realm amenities, which in turn would be welcomed by residents. However, if no permission is retained, suggestion to consider returning this portion of the farm to active use
- Hill House should be included within the village envelope

###### *Summary of objections*

- Objections to the proposals for the following reasons:
  - o Concerns over the Manor Farm development as the roads and infrastructure are not suitable for public transport but better public transport is required
  - o Potential impacts on AONB
  - o The village is isolated with a lack of services and facilities
  - o General traffic concerns and the single road through the village may struggle with increased development
  - o No mains sewerage
  - o No street lighting
  - o Question over affordability of houses – will houses be available only to local people to meet village needs or available to all buyers?

- Objection to amendments to village envelope and removal of land from the Green Belt. It is illogical and to the eastern part of the expansion a part of land has been included which contributes significantly to biodiversity.
- Not all recent development is sensitive towards the Conservation Area
- Objectives within the plan do not align with the allocation at Hinton Martell in terms of safeguarding natural environment, improving character of towns and villages, growth of employment sectors, affordable and sustainable range of housing, reducing need to travel, helping communities thrive

#### *Comments surrounding Manor Farm*

- This would seem a good area for development. The existing barn and farm buildings are unattractive, unkempt and the site is littered with debris and obsolete farm machinery. The site has a pleasant outlook. However, access is not good with the existing track offering extremely poor visibility and a dangerous exit via a blind bend onto the main road through the village. Extra parking and traffic here might prove problematic. More detailed plans showing provision for cars and access design will need to be provided prior to further opportunities for consultation/comment. **(Vale of Allen Parish Council)**
- Good area for development but poor access – needs new access
- Access issues with construction vehicles
- Promotion of land at Manor Farm
- Potential impacts on existing sewerage plant

#### *Comments surrounding Land Adjoining Church Mead*

- Difficult land to level and develop, needs access consideration
- Possibly a difficult site to level and develop. Access plans will be crucial as a route out onto Uppington Hill road would be very precarious and a potential problem. **(Vale of Allen Parish Council)**

#### 5.4.10 Holt

- Holt Village Envelope appears to have been extended to include parcels of agricultural land bought by residents and incorporated into their gardens (Holt Lane). We therefore request the original village envelope boundary is kept as is and not extended as shown in this consultation document. **(Holt Parish Council)**
- No comments on infill of settlement. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Flooding from the watercourse and known surface water flow paths need to be taken into consideration and sequentially avoided. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Support for amendments to village envelope as they are logical
- Suggestion to include Vicarage Farm in envelope

#### 5.4.11 Horton

- No comments on infill of settlement. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- The consultation document does not have regard to the NPPF policy for small housing sites
- promotion of piece of land north-east of Horton
- Comments surrounding the exclusion of land at Horton – this is unfounded; Horton has facilities and is recognised as a Village in the settlement hierarchy. There is limited justification of exclusion on heritage grounds and its allocation could include a community facility and SANG



#### 5.4.12 Longham

##### *Summary of objections*

Many Concerns regarding the policy and proposed development were received and these were grouped into the following areas:

- Infill will cause further traffic issues related to Longham Bridge. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Infrastructure concerns
  - o Concerns specifically about the infrastructure around Ham Lane
  - o Longham Bridge is listed and so capacity is not able to be increased
  - o Traffic and congestion
  - o Current pressure on infrastructure is high
  - o Concern about HGVs that will have to come through for the development.
- Flooding concerns and drainage issues
  - o Objection to development at Ham Lane as it is in a flood zone
- Objection to development on the grounds of overdevelopment of the community
- Objection to loss of Green Belt
- Ecological, biodiversity and wildlife concerns
  - o Concerns over impact on Longham Lakes and local nature reserves
- Erosion of and changing to the village character
- Loss of quality of life for residents

##### *Comments of support:*

- Support for revision of village envelope. This is a sustainable location, and given that the area is to be the subject a large scale urban extension, it only makes more sense to increase the village envelope boundary revision to include other land.
- Support for Angel Lane development over Dudsbury Golf Course

##### *Promotion of further sites:*

- Land west of Ringwood Road and North of Ham Lane provide suitable and sustainable development opportunities and should be released from the Green Belt
- Land opposite and to the rear of the Kings Arms
- Land north of Green Lane
- Village envelope should be extended to include the land adjoining the Councils proposed settlement policy boundary revision at 35 Ham Lane, Longham - this area of land is well contained, performs no function that adds anything to the Green Belt and would allow for an increase in the windfall potential of the district, that would contribute to housing land supply.

#### 5.4.13 Shapwick

##### **Draft Policy 5.34 Public Open Space – Shapwick**

- No comments to add regarding the small amount of infill development (Dorset County Council)
- This policy proposes that the area for public open space allocated in the old Local Plan is carried forward - no fundamental objection to the creation of further public open space in the village. However, since the old Local Plan was adopted (2002), a village green and play area has been created on land south of Stewards Lane so should reflect this in the plan by reducing the size of the proposed public open space allocation accordingly. **(National Trust)**



- Broad support for the enlargement of the village policy envelope. Over the last thirty years, very little if any new housing has been established in the village. Discussions with the local community indicate that there is a desire for 'revitalisation' of the village, with some new housing, including affordable housing for young families. The enlarged policy envelope for infill housing will not necessarily create significant opportunities for affordable housing provision. However, there will be more options than before. Whether such options get taken forward for new infill housing will depend on a number of factors, including compliance with other planning policies and feedback from the local community. Suggestion that Land to the south of West Street and Single plot on Piccadilly Lane are included within the village envelope. Recommend that the AONB partnership is consulted. **(National Trust)**
- A housing option / allocation with more potential for on-site affordable housing would benefit the village, one area that has been considered in the past is on the south-east side of the High Street 'in between the land allocated for public open space and the Old Post Office'. A minimum of 10 new dwellings may be more appropriate, to respect the generally linear form of the village. Any such housing allocation should however be subject to further community consultation and engagement. **(National Trust)**

#### 5.4.14 Sixpenny Handley

##### Draft Policy 5.35 Housing Options Sixpenny Handley

- Broad support for plans and can accommodate 120 dwellings. Consider Village Hall, bowling green and tennis courts should not be included within the village envelope- that the change in that area should be limited to the gardens marked and the additional houses in Common Road which are to the north east of the existing envelope. Objection to land east of Dean Lane being included in village envelope- this is industrial land and should only be developed as part of a larger proposal for the option land to its north east. **(Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council)**
- No transport modelling has been done, requirement for public transport improvement are necessary. **(Dorset County Council Environment)**
- There is a long history of groundwater flood risk at Sixpenny Handley that should be included within the SFRA and the introduction section. **(Dorset County Council)**
- The Most southern site Frogmore Lane should have the sequential test applied. The updated SFRA should identify the known flood risk area to this location. **(Dorset County Council)**
- Support for policy – Sixpenny Handley is quite a large village so some housing could be beneficial. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Sixpenny Handley STW has some treatment headroom. Depending on the rate and timing of development additional treatment capacity will be required in the medium to long term. **(Wessex Water)**
- Introduction should note how Sixpenny Handley is a particularly important village in this AONB. The proposed development of a minimum of 120 dwellings is not insignificant for a village within an AONB- the potential impacts on the AONB appear to be much more likely than any impacts on heathland which is at least 5km away. There should be developer contributions to AONB matters. Concerns that the provision of affordable housing is only up to a 50% level and does not provide for a guaranteed minimum level - affordable houses should be provided in small as well as large developments. Village hall and playing fields are important facilities and

should be protected and not subject to redevelopment. Consideration that the western extension of the village infill envelope should be removed. Furthermore, the southern section of the south eastern extension of the infill policy envelope is quite exposed and development there would significantly change the character of the village, particularly when approached along the road from the south. **(Dorset AONB)**

- Promotion of land west of The Orchard and land east of Dean Lane.

#### 5.4.15 Sturminster Marshall

##### Draft Policy 5.36 Housing Options for Sturminster Marshall

###### *Comments*

- Objection to amount of development on flooding and congestion grounds and requirement for increased parking and bus provision and healthcare services. **(Sturminster Marshall Parish Council)**
- The village offers limited transport alternatives so will be largely car-dependent. Bus service provision will be required for connections to Blandford, Wimborne and Poole. There are opportunities for improvements to the nearby North Dorset Trailway for better cycle and pedestrian links and possibly providing non-car links across the A31 for improved connectivity to the south. This option is likely to increase traffic on the A350, A31 and the Roundhouse Roundabout. As the updated SEDMMTS will not include detailed traffic movements for Sturminster Marshall, a high-level traffic study would be the most appropriate way forward to identify the general distribution of trips, with more detailed transport modelling work required if this option was to go through to the preferred options stage. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Analysis of impacts on A350 needs to be included. **(Sturminster Marshall Parish Council)**
- Development should be limited to behind the school
- Objection to new sports pitch as there are existing facilities within the village and funds should instead be put towards this
- Suggestions for amendments to scheme to develop exclusive lakeside policies to reduce density and increase size of homes

###### *Summary of objections*

- Main objections comments related to:
  - o Erosion of village feel
  - o Flooding
  - o Increases in traffic and congestion
    - White Mill Bridge at capacity and lack of capacity to expand
    - Dangers of increased traffic
    - Increased car use
    - Lack of parking
    - Roads are too narrow and not suitable for lorries
  - o Ruining of views
  - o Not a sustainable location
  - o Impacts on biodiversity and loss of habitats including bats
  - o Urban sprawl

- Services and facilities being at capacity including schools, health, roads, public transport, sewage
- Disproportionate share of development
- Noise pollution and light pollution
- Loss of Green Belt
- Loss of recreation land
- Building in flood zones and flooding concerns
- Building near to the AONB
- Concerns that affordable housing will not come forwards
- New play area unnecessary
- Other areas are more suitable for development and there are existing empty residential properties. A few existing sites could be allocated instead - Moor Lane, and Newton Rd.
- Greenfield should be protected
- More industrial units not needed- some units are already empty so why create more
- Objection to development being referred to as modest as it would be a sizeable increase in the village

#### *Comments of support*

- Support for the policy/development for the following reasons:
  - Good road connections for nearby employment
  - Ability to sustain services and facilities could be increased
  - Need to keep young people in the village
  - But requires guarantee that infrastructure and utilities are adequate and in place and level of affordable housing needs to be close to 50%
  - Support for the plan in general but concerns about infrastructure and social housing commitments, high levels of affordable housing are needed for young people
  - Support for development, comments surrounding NIBMYism. For this to be a thriving village community the children of village residents should have the opportunity and chance to buy and rent a property to remain in the village.

#### *Further considerations:*

- Policy 5.36 Sturminster Marshall, this proposed allocation of 250 units it within 5km of designated heathlands and will require a SANG as well as a biodiversity survey to determine any constraints if it is to come forward. **(Natural England)**
- Policy not strong enough with regards to contributions towards transport infrastructure; specific items should be referenced such as bridleway in relation to Bailie Way industrial estate development, and a ramp accesses at Newton Road and Parklea; Need to improve access on foot and by cycling to make sites more sustainable; Secure sum through S106 to cover future maintenance. **(North Dorset Trailway Network)**

#### *Promotion of further sites:*

- Request to include Dorset Springs old trout fishery/quarry site in the allocation
- Land South of Newton Road
- Sturminster Marshall Golf Club

#### Draft Policy 5.37 Land at Station Road

- Objection to just providing sports pitches without any supporting facilities including changing areas etc. **(Sturminster Marshall Parish Council)**

#### Draft Policy 5.38 Bailie Gate Employment Allocation, Sturminster Marshall

- Support. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Concerns over amenity of development at Station Road site if employment site is expanded
- Concerns over infrastructure, village character and ecology
- Support for policy
- Objection to development
- Roads are not suitable for lorries and large vehicles

#### 5.4.16 Three Legged Cross

##### Draft Policy 5.39 Woolsbridge Employment Allocation, Three Legged Cross

- Promotion of site of land at Oak Tree Barn, Ringwood Road, Three Legged Cross, BH21 6RE
- Agree with policy. **(Dorset CPRE)**
- Support for development at and expansion of Three Legged Cross and Woolsbridge Industrial estate

#### 5.4.17 Wimborne St Giles

##### Draft Policy 5.40 Housing Options for Wimborne St Giles

###### *Comments*

- Suggestions to amendments to policy to comply with outcomes of public planning meetings. The number of proposed residences was no more than 25 within the envelope, with a possibility of a further 5 outside. The Wimborne St Giles element of the plan seems to create a slightly less well-defined constraint of overall numbers than was understood as the outcome of initial local consultation. Proposed amendments: Delete: 'Land at Wimborne St Giles will be allocated for housing development to provide a minimum of 30 dwellings'. Insert: 'Land at Wimborne St Giles will be allocated for housing development to provide a maximum of 25 dwellings within the envelope, increasing to 30 overall when existing sites near the village, but outside the envelope, are taken into account'. Delete: 'Land between Harley Cottage and Harriet Cottage'. Insert: 'Land between Harley Cottage and the track leading to Thick-a-Thack'. **(Knowlton Parish Council)**
- Considerations from Wimborne St Giles community vision **(comments from Shaftesbury Estate):**
  - o Agreement to small scale sensitive development In keeping with the current style and feel of the village Preserving what makes WSG special, not making dramatic changes
  - o Mix of rented accommodation and owner occupied
  - o Mix of demographic - young families, estate workers, elderly Desire to retain a community which 'belongs' has roots in WSG - connected through family or affection / affinity
  - o Inclusion of commercial activities in the overall plan for the village providing employment and attracting more diverse residents.
  - o The need to support and maintain community amenities that facilitate the positive functioning of the village including social, amenities, transport and communications infrastructure.

- The introduction of the village envelope in the draft Local Plan will help us bring this plan in to reality and therefore I am very supportive of this policy. To the North I feel the extent of the envelope should reach the track leading to Thick-a-Thack rather than to Harriet Cottage as currently shown, which would be consistent with the plans developed with the community. Any new development must adhere to the principles that were discussed by the community in 2016, listed above. Furthermore, I would like to stress that plans brought forward by the Estate will be done in consultation with the community. Particular care and attention will be made to ensure new development suits the style and character of the village and the scale must be appropriate for the village. Suggestion that 25 dwellings would be more appropriate than the 30 mentioned in the plan and the policy and sites should be amended accordingly.

### *Concerns and objections*

Concerns and objections on the following grounds:

- Concerns proposal is substantial and would have a significant impact on landscape character. Clearly affordable housing is the priority in this area. A contribution from any development should be made to AONB purposes from a village that is within the AONB rather than towards heathlands that are over 5km away. The historical structure of the village relates to development on the rising ground either side of the water meadows within the center of the valley. However, housing generally does not reach up onto the higher downlands and therefore the village has a very clear and historic structure around the river. Development further up on the downlands risks changing that historic structure and the proposal to include the flood plain around the River Allen within the village infill policy envelope would have major landscape impacts as well as appearing to be an arbitrary proposal contrary to the options considered in the earlier discussion. Because of the detailed history of this village it is important that any policy includes a specific reference to understanding and conserving the heritage. **(Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**
- Concerns that the 30 dwellings will be solely car dependent. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Insufficient infrastructure and roads capacity, lack of facilities and services, impact of increased population, impact on the character of the village, road safety concerns for pedestrians and due to single track roads, need to protect Green Belt and preserve village character, ecological impacts
- Objection to development on the grounds of impacts on Conservation area, listed buildings, rural farming community and AONB. Concerns over impacts of character and appearance of the village and loss of green belt. Lack of infrastructure to support development
- Concerns over the amount of development proposed (30 dwellings) which is an increase of over 25% of the population, too much for a small village within the AONB. Character of the village would change and this would constitute 'significant development' which is seeking to be avoided within para 5.4.17.2. Dwellings would need to be built incrementally and over a period of 15-20 years to retain the character of the village and meet actual housing demand.
- Objection to development at Baileys Hill on the grounds of increased noise and light pollution from 5 proposed properties, environmental damage, poor infrastructure and unfair distribution of housing stock.

- Objection to 25 new homes on the grounds of development not being 'modest' as it would increase the settlement by 50% and be a substantial change

*Further comments:*

- The policy should make reference to the need to avoid harm to protected European species and their foraging areas as well as the need to avoid impacts on the AONB landscape features. There are opportunities for biodiversity and landscape enhancement which should be highlighted in the supporting paragraphs. **(Natural England)**
- Our records show there are no Wessex Water public sewers at this location. **(Wessex Water)**
- Agree. **(Dorset CPRE)**

**5.4.18 Woodlands / Whitmore**

- No comments on infill development. **(Dorset County Council Economy)**
- Suggestion of inclusion of land at Brook lane, Woodlands as suitable for small scale policy compliant residential development.

## 6. Appendices

### 6.1 A - Affordable Housing Definitions

- Concern over definition of starter homes which are not affordable in perpetuity and these should instead be affordable homes

### 6.2 B - Guidelines for the Establishment of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs)

No specific comments received.

### 6.3 C - Glossary

- A definition on Local Nature Partnership should be included in the glossary. It is noted that Local Enterprise Partnerships are included twice in the glossary. **(Dorset Local Nature Partnership)**
- Appendix C, Glossary, is helpful but has some illogical omissions. AONB, for example, is not include even though the Dorset Wildlife Trust is, along with National Park. Local Enterprise Partnership is entered twice with different explanations. Whilst it is good to see landscape character is included it is disappointing that Historic Park and Garden is not, even though Listed Building is included **(Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB)**