

Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Plan Representation Summary

Puddletown Parish Council submitted their final version of the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan (2017-2031) to Dorset Council for independent examination in June 2020. People were given six weeks from Friday 26th June 2020 until the end of Friday 7th August 2020, to comment on the content of the plan or how it was produced. At the close of the public consultation 29 representations were received. Two of the representations were late. These are shown as **highlighted text**.

The following table is a summary of the representations received, as required by Regulation 4(3)(b)(iii) of the Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012. Copies of the original, full representations as they were submitted to Dorset Council are available online from: www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/puddletown-neighbourhood-plan

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
1	Battens Solicitors on behalf of Lorna Chinnah	<p>Clients land has been removed from the defined development boundary. The Land is marked on the draft development boundary document produced by the Parish Council and also the existing policies map accompanying the Local Plan.</p> <p>Our client currently rents out the Property and included within its tenancy is the use of the Land attached to the Property. The tenant uses the Land to grow vegetables and as an extension to the garden of the property. The land is fenced off from the avenue of trees located next to it, and unless permitted by our client or her tenant, the Land cannot be accessed by the public.</p> <p>It is not clear why the Land has been removed from the defined development boundary and reasons for its removal have not been provided within the Neighbourhood Plan or any accompanying documents.</p> <p>The Parish Council had sought for the land to be included as Local Green Space. This designation was challenged and the Land was removed from the Local Green Space designation given that the Land did not meet the criteria for local green space. It is therefore possible that in Parish Council's removal of the Land as potential green space, they removed it from defined development boundary and failed to correct it.</p> <p>If of course this is not the case, then our client strongly objects to the removal of the Land from the Defined</p>

		<p>Development Boundary.</p> <p>General guidance for the defined development boundary in a Neighbourhood Plan is, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delineate acceptable areas for development;• Follow a consistent approach to development boundaries based on an agreed set of criteria relevant to both rural and urban settlements;• Follow clearly defined physical features (e.g. hedgerows, roads and streams);• Include curtilage of dwellings <p>Some of this guidance is reaffirmed in the Local Plan at paragraph 3.3.27</p> <p>It is not apparent from the draft Neighbourhood Plan, what criteria based strategy has been applied for the removal of the Land from the existing defined development boundary. Further, the Local Plan para 3.3.27 recognises introducing or extending a development boundary but does not suggest that land already designated within the defined development boundary should be removed without justification.</p> <p>As stated above, the Land is used as an extension to residential curtilage of the property (a residential garden) and ought properly to be included within the defined development boundary.</p> <p>The Local Plan reiterates this point at paragraph 3.5.4 where it states that: Neighbourhood Development plans have the potential to <i>“extend existing defined development boundary, or adding them to settlements that do not currently have a boundary”</i></p> <p>When considering the strategic objectives of the Local Authority contained within the Local Plan the strategic approach is that <i>“it is expected that neighbourhood development plans and other appropriate planning tools will be used to help bring forward new development, and may allocate additional sites, or extend an existing (or add a new) development boundary to help deliver this new growth”</i></p> <p>Policy SUS5 confirms that Neighbourhood Plans should contribute to Local Plan strategic objectives. Removal of this Land is believed to conflict with the Local Plan strategic objectives as it seeks to remove land previously contained within the defined development boundary rather than retain it or extend the existing development boundary in order</p>
--	--	--

		<p>to help deliver appropriate growth.</p> <p>Furthermore the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 29 is as follows: <i>“Neighbourhood Plans should not promote less development than set out in strategic policies for the area or undermine those strategic policies.”</i></p> <p>Removal of the Land from the defined development boundary is promoting less development and undermining the existing policies map accompanying the Local Plan, which clearly includes the Land within the defined development boundary.</p> <p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan for Puddletown does not provide reasoning or justification for removal of the land from the existing defined development boundary. It does however provide at paragraph 4.1.9 that: <i>“Adjustments had been made to the Defined Development Boundary to include these sites (and exclude land that is not been protected from development such as local green spaces).</i></p> <p>Our client was not aware through the public consultation period that the land was to be removed from the defined development boundary and would have objected at this stage.</p> <p>It may therefore be the case that when initially designating the Land for local greenspace, the Land was removed from the defined development boundary and following removal of the Land from designation as local green space, the Land was not re-included within the defined development boundary. This would accord para 4.1.9 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>If that was not the case, then the removal of the Land from the defined development boundary does not accord with Paragraph 4.1.9 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Local Authority are therefore asked to consider the defined development boundary plan submitted by Puddletown Parish Council alongside their draft Neighbourhood Plan and seek inclusion of the land within defined development boundary.</p>
--	--	---

Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – August 2020

2	Kevin Bumby	I fully support the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan. This is the culmination of extensive consultation within the village and should be supported by Dorset Council.
3	Wendy Roseby	<p>I would like to object to the planning of proposed houses at the back of Butt Close.</p> <p>The area chosen would restrict access to our local doctors surgery. Also there is sheltered in Rod Hill Close that is full of elderly residents, who already have to suffer unwanted noise and who walk to the Surgery. Has this sheltered Community been taken into consideration when submitting these plans. The sheltered Community is run by Magna Housing, have they been advise?</p>
4	Gordon Sneddon Dorset Council Service Manager for Travel Operations	I've had a look through the transport related elements of the plan and have nothing particular to add at this stage
5	Gaynor Gallacher Highways England	<p>In general terms we are satisfied that the plans proposed policies are unlikely to lead to development which would generate a level of vehicle trips that would result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the trunk road, and we are supportive of those policies which seek to maintain and enhance local facilities and services and improve sustainable transport links as these will contribute to reducing the need to travel by private car. However, we have noted the various references to the impact of A35 traffic noise on the community, and the proposed housing allocations which have the potential to impact on the trunk road operational asset.</p> <p>In terms of noise, Project 4 and Policy 9 are noted. We support the requirement that new housing and noise sensitive development proposals shall be accompanied by a satisfactory assessment of noise impacts, and appropriate mitigation measures provided where necessary. We have previously drawn attention to the requirements of DfT Circular 02/2013, Annex A, paragraph A1, which states that for reasons of safety, liability and maintenance, noise fences, screening and other structures must be erected within the developers land, and far enough within the developers land to enable maintenance to take place without encroachment onto highway land. We therefore welcome recognition within the document of the need to engage with Highways England in the development of any noise mitigation measures.</p>

		<p>We have also noted that the reserve housing site at Northbrook Farm, allocated under Policy 13, may also present issues regarding visual screening and drainage as well as noise due to its proximity to the trunk road. In this case the Circular’s requirements under paragraphs 49 and 50 would also require consideration in any future development proposal. We therefore welcome the inclusion of points b) and c) within Policy 13 to ensure any proposals are acceptable to Highways England and reflect the requirements of Circular 02/2013.</p> <p>These comments do not prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.</p>
6	<p>Dorset Council Engineer (Development Liaison)</p> <p>Infrastructure Service</p>	<p>With regards to the above Transport Development Management would make the following comments:</p> <p>Site 1: Chapel Ground – Access from Athelhampton Road appears achievable – suitable spacing from Millom Lane will need to be provided</p> <p>Site 2: Land at Rod Hill Lane – Significant improvements (widening, footways, etc) would be required to Milon Lane and alterations to the speed limit. Access via Rod Hill Lane would require significant improvements which may not be achievable.</p> <p>Site 3: The Combe – Access via Rod Hill Lane would require significant improvements which may not be achievable. Access via White Hill would require significant works due to levels (unlikely to be possible). In addition, New Street and Coombe Road not suitable given the likely quantum of development – would likely require significant alterations and improvements.</p> <p>Site 4: Kite Hill – Unlikely to be a suitable access achievable to the public highway</p> <p>Site 5: Pastures Field – Access via bridleway highly unlikely to be acceptable. Access should either be gained through site 6: Three Lanes via Three Lanes Way (likely to be best) or via the existing recreation ground access (may be achievable with appropriate improvements). The 2 Bridleways will need special consideration/protection.</p> <p>Site 6: Three Lanes - Access via Three Lanes Way appears achievable with minimal alterations/improvements</p> <p>Site 7: Judges Meadow – Access via The Moor maybe achievable but would likely require complete removal of site</p>

Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – August 2020

		<p>hedgerow</p> <p>Site 8: Northbrook Farm – Access via the Long Lane onto The Moor maybe achievable. A new access direct onto The Moor may not be achievable given the nature of the highway in this vicinity. Footway improvement/linkage to Puddletown would be required.</p>
7	Valentine Cox.	<p>I wish to object to the wording in Item 4 - Catmead Grass Space, of the LGS Assessment in the Puddletown plan which has recently been submitted to you.</p> <p>Under the reasons explanation for including this area it states that this makes the area more pleasant and is suitable for "informal play".</p> <p>It further shows that this is private land with no public access. In that case any non residents of Catmead indulging in "informal play" would be trespassing.</p> <p>As it is totally wrong for the Parish Council to encourage trespassing I request that the phrase about informal play should be deleted from the plan.</p>
8	Mr J Bracey River Cottage 7 Catmead	<p>I am a member of the Catmead Green Space Committee and am concerned Catmead has been identified as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>I do not know why the Parish Council has decided to renege on their promise, but it paints a very worrying picture if elected officials cannot be trusted to uphold the wishes of the residents, who after all are paying for their services via Council Tax payments.</p> <p>I object to Catmead being included as a designated Local green Space as it is private land, bought, owned and maintained at a premium by the Catmead residents. It is a private communal garden for the exclusive use of the Catmead residents and their invited family and friends.</p> <p>If the members of the Parish Council wish to open their private gardens for the use of other members of the public then that is their choice (although I didn't notice any included in the plan). But our land is not up for grabs.</p>

Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – August 2020

		<p>Furthermore this breaches the Human Rights of my neighbours and myself</p> <p>Schedule 1, Article 8 of The Human Rights Act 1998 refers to Right to respect for private and family life. With sub-section 2 stating There shall be no interference by a public authority, which the Local Parish Plan clearly breaches. My neighbours and I are willing to seek legal opinion and action on this point.</p> <p>If it is included in the plan it will create confusion and people will stray from the public footpath and onto our private land. Unless you want a Police unit in Catmead 24/7 in order to Prevent a Breach of the Peace whilst trespassers are lawfully ejected from private land then I strongly suggest that Catmead and any thought of it is removed from the Local Parish Plan as a Designated Local Green Space.</p>
9	Matt Verlander on behalf of National Grid	<p>National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf.</p> <p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets:</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>Further guidance supplied.</p>
10	Amy Powner on behalf of Dorset Dogs (Urban Heaths Partnership/Dorset Council)	<p>Support the approach of the plan in recognising the importance of both access to outdoor recreation and wildlife and landscape conservation.</p> <p>In respect of links to and recreation at Puddletown Forest and heathland areas recommend also including Urban Heaths Partnership in liaison for public engagement and other work balancing access and wildlife resources in the area. Contact via warden for that area</p> <p>UHP & DD already work with DC at adjacent Thorncombe Woods and with Forestry England on various sites and have skills and experience in helping to manage and make the most of issues and opportunities for people and wildlife, particularly in relation to heathland areas and alternatives to heathland.</p>
11	Dorset Ramblers	<p>The Ramblers works to help everyone enjoy the pleasures and benefits of walking, and to enhance and protect the</p>

		<p>places where people walk. As walkers and users of the countryside, we understand the importance of our environment for the health and wellbeing of all. We are committed to encouraging and supporting walking, protecting and expanding public rights of way and access land, and protecting the beauty of the countryside and other areas.</p> <p>The Ramblers commends the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan as submitted for examination, in particular for its very positive policies intended to protect and enhance local green spaces (Policy 1), protect wildlife and natural habitats (Policy 6), protect European and internationally protected sites (Policy 7), and its desire to create safer roads and pedestrian/cycle routes (Policy 15).</p> <p>We especially welcome the measures set out in Table 8 (Traffic Management Proposals) and the recognition that the provision of new footpaths and bridleways should be part of any traffic management regime. The Ramblers would welcome the opportunity to work with the Puddletown Area Parish Council as it takes these initiatives forward</p>
12	Mr Paul Willis Head of Planning Feniton Park Ltd	<p>General</p> <p>Feniton Park Limited’s initial concern is that there was no opportunity offered to discuss its proposals for the residential / community development of land at Rod Hill Lane beyond the 3 day design forum that took place over 2 1/2 years ago in September 2017. A number of misassumptions and inaccuracies which have now been perpetuated in the Plan could have been clarified and removed had further discussions taken place.</p> <p>This clearly was not the case with the two sites that have been put forward in the Plan for residential development at Chapel Ground (now Land at Athelhampton Road) and Northbrook Farm. Indeed the minutes of the meeting of the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on 9th September 2019 record that “Members agreed to write to landowners at two of the sites requesting information before a final decision is made”. It appears that the landowners / developers of these sites have been afforded the opportunity to clarify, amplify and improve their proposals and offer outside of the formal process. It is disappointing that this opportunity was not extended to Feniton Park Limited.</p> <p>Housing Location (Policy 10)</p> <p>Feniton Park Limited disagree with the location of housing at Land at Athelhampton Road for 18- 22 dwellings and community uses (Policy 12) and with the reserve site allocation for up to 12 dwellings at Northbrook Farm (Policy 13). It is considered that land at Rod Hill Lane is much better suited for housing and community development.</p>

		<p>Land at Athelhampton Road (Policy 12) is unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The site is divorced from the existing development boundary and represents largely linear ribbon development alongside Athelhampton Road at the very eastern extremity of the village. It will extend development some 365 metres beyond the existing development boundary into open countryside. The Site Assessment Report produced by AECOM 2018 states in Appendix A that the site is adjacent to and connected with the existing built up area. This is factually incorrect and should have been designated as being ‘outside the existing built up area’. The nearest part of the site lies some 65 metres beyond the existing development boundary.2. The site is highly visible from the Athelhampton Road on the eastern approach to and exit from the village. The Site Assessment Report produced by AECOM 2018 states in Appendix A “However the site is highly visible on the eastern approach to Puddletown. Additionally, the northern half of the site is likely to be visible from the town itself.” Development of the site would also impact on the setting of, and views from the Puddletown, Stinsford and Lower Bockhampton and Tolpuddle Conservation Area. The site borders a much greater proportion of the Puddletown Conservation Area along the Athelhampton Road than the Rod Hill Lane site. The site is classified as being of medium sensitivity to development.3. The site is located in close proximity to Little Knoll Copse, which is an area of Deciduous Woodland Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat, and is also an ancient woodland. Disturbance may take place from new development at this location from noise, light pollution or trampling from enhanced access (AECOM 2018 Para 4.4).4. The development will adversely affect the setting and context of three architecturally important buildings on the Athelhampton Road frontage and the amenity of the residents.5. Land within the northern section of the site is within a groundwater flood warning area. As such the Plan recognises in Para 4.3.7 that “there have been localised flooding problems....which will need to be resolved and measures included to ensure any surface water run-off would remain below existing levels”. These measures increase the site development costs and therefore reduce the level of affordable housing that can be offered.6. A new high standard access will be required into the site from Athelhampton Road which will further serve to reinforce the linear urbanisation of the eastern approach to the village. In addition the high cost of such a junction reduces the level of affordable housing that can be offered as part of the development.
--	--	--

		<p>7. This site is one of the furthest from the existing services and facilities in the village. At its eastern extremity it is some 180 metres further than the most eastern boundary of the Rod Hill site. The Athelhampton Road site is therefore less likely to succeed in meeting the SEA objective ‘Promote sustainable transport use and reduce the need to travel’.</p> <p>8. Contrary to the recommendations of FERIA Urbanism resulting from the September 2017 Design Forum, no separate pedestrian cycle link is proposed linking to St Mary’s Middle School. This link can be provided through the Rod Hill Lane site providing a safe and sustainable transport route thereby reducing the need for car based journeys. It will assist in setting sustainable travel habits in young people which can last a life time.</p> <p>Northbrook Farm (Policy 13) is unsuitable as a reserve housing site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is divorced from the existing development boundary being some 130 metres from the boundary. It is therefore correctly categorised by AECOM as being ‘outside the development boundary’ 2. This site is the furthest from the existing services and facilities in the village. The Northbrook Farm site is therefore least likely of all the sites to succeed in meeting the SEA objective ‘Promote sustainable transport use and reduce the need to travel’. 3. The Site Assessment Report produced by AECOM 2018 states at Para 4.49 “Due to the site’s immediate proximity to the A35 and the A354 junction, the site suffers significantly from noise pollution issues”. 4. AECOM recommends “Given noise pollution issues, and the relative distance of the services and facilities or Puddletown Village centre, the site is not appropriate for a housing led-development” (Para 4.53) And yet this site is allocated as a reserve housing site? <p>The site at Rod Hill Lane should be allocated for housing development in Policy 12 for the following reasons:</p>
--	--	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site abuts the existing development boundary. The landowner owns Rod Hill Lane. Appendix A to the Site Assessment Report (AECOM 2018) identifies the site as being adjacent to and connected with the existing built up area. This is not the case with either Land at Athelhampton Road or Northbrook Farm. Therefore as noted in Appendix 6 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan “The development would not significantly extend the village beyond its current limits or impact on existing residents”. This cannot be said of Land at Athelhampton Road or Northbrook Farm. 2. Both the Rod Hill Lane site and Land at Athelhampton Road are assessed identically in landscape terms by AECOM 2018 being “medium sensitivity to development”. In both cases the northern parts of the sites are considered to be less sensitive in landscape and village-scape terms. However, with respect to Rod Hill AECOM comment that there are “short views into the site due to screening from hedgerows and the Doctors Surgery”. On site planting on the lower (southern) part of the site would further reduce any visual impact. Land at Athelhampton Road has a significantly greater visual impact (long views) on the approach to and exit from the village. 3. The site is the significantly closer to the village centre and existing facilities and services than either Land at Athelhampton Road or Northbrook Farm. It is therefore the most likely of the three sites to succeed in meeting the SEA objective ‘Promote sustainable transport use and reduce the need to travel’. 4. There are no access constraints. The site can be easily and safely accessed from Athelhampton Road using a short extension of the existing access to the Doctors Surgery via Rod Hill Lane. This situation was presented to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group at the Design Forum in September 2017. Confirmation that Dorset Council as Highway Authority is content that the access is suitable for far in excess of 22 dwellings is contained in the following e-mail dated 18th December 2019 (original supplied). <p>Therefore the Highway Authority do not agree with the Neighbourhood Plan which states in Appendix 6 that “The site would have to be accessed off Milom Lane, which would urbanise the character of the Lane”. Neither do the Highway Authority agree with AECOM 2018 who state in Appendix A that “Access into the northern section of the site is more suitable, but is potentially constrained by the Doctors Surgery and highway safety concerns at the junction between Milom Lane and Athelhampton Road”. The Highway</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Authority has expressed no concerns about the suitability of Rod Hill Lane to access the development nor has it raised road safety concerns on the surrounding highway network.</p> <p>5. In addition a safe and sustainable pedestrian and cycle route can be provided across the site to the middle school. The Neighbourhood Plan recognises this in Appendix 6 where it comments “it potentially provides an opportunity to negotiate a pedestrian link around the southern edge of the village (as the land is in the same ownership) but this would need to navigate across the sunken Green Lane and could prove costly (and may not be feasible).” Of more concern is that the Strategic Environmental Assessment Report commented positively on the potential route saying “the Rod Hill Lane alternative potentially could help secure an alternative route to the south-west linking to the school” but then disregards its significance by adding “however the feasibility of this needs further investigation and therefore <u>this has not been included in the score</u>”. It seems perverse and unfair that Feniton Park Limited was not invited to provide further information to substantiate their ability to deliver such a key piece of sustainable infrastructure and the Rod Hill Lane site has been scored down as a result.</p> <p>6. The site could provide appropriate community facilities / allotments / public open space as suggested by the community. This was offered by Feniton Park Limited at the Design Forum in September 2017. Sadly we were not afforded an opportunity to engage with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group or community to expand on our offer. This is recognised in the Strategic Environmental Assessment 2019 where it states (page 19) “The Chapel Ground site allocation includes land for a community facility in addition to public open space and the provision of allotments. Whilst the Rod Hill Lane alternative could potentially also accommodate a community facility <u>there is less clarity on this point</u>”. Again it appears that the Rod Hill site has been scored down because of not being afforded the same opportunity as other sites to engage and clarify our offer.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In paragraph 4.3.3 of the Neighbourhood Plan it is recognised that “the different pro’s and con’s between the site options means there is no clear ‘front runner’ and the choice of site allocations considered all the factors and issues identified”. Given that the choice is difficult between the option sites and it’s a ‘close run thing’ then accurate and full information about the pros and cons of the sites is essential. Sadly the assessment process has not been properly informed and this has been to the detriment of the Rod Hill Lane site.</p> <p>The incorrect representation of highway access as being unsafe and environmentally damaging, the lack of any</p>
--	--	--

		<p>description and credit for the offer of community facilities and open space, the failure to properly explore and score the potential of a dedicated pedestrian/cycle link through the site to the school and wider village and the overplay of the landscape impacts of the northern part of the Rod Hill Site when compared to Land at Athelhampton Road have led the site being excluded from the Plan.</p> <p>In summary the Rod Hill Lane site should be allocated for 18 - 22 dwellings and community facilities in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It abuts the existing development boundary • The northern part of the site on which development would take place has localised landscape impacts that can be mitigated • It is the most sustainable site in transport terms being closest to the village centre and services and facilities thereby reducing reliance on the private car • It would utilise an existing access which has the approval of Dorset Council in its role as Highway Authority as being suitable and safe. • It can provide a safe pedestrian / cycle route across the site linking to the middle school and wider village • It would provide community facilities, allotments and public open space in consultation with the community <p>Email from Steve Savage Dorset Council Transport development Manager Attached</p>
13	Richard Edge Assetsphere	We write on behalf of the owner of Land at Athelhampton Road (referred in the NP as Chapel Ground) Simon and Judith Banfield. The land is known as Land at Athelhampton Road, if it is possible to amend this, that would be good,

		<p>however we appreciate this may complicate matters!!</p> <p>On the whole we commend the work of the NPSG and are supportive of the draft plan, we have made a few comments below on the various policies.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan to 2031 with review in 2024 allows for growth of 6-7 dwellings per year (66-77). The plan confirms that this does not comply with Government assessment for housing need and we respectfully suggest that it may be prudent to improve the chances of making the plan sound to allow for possible additional growth at the 2024 review to take the plan to 2031.</p> <p>Broadly we support the policies as detailed below and make the following comments in respect of the plan generally and with specific reference to Land at Athelhampton Road (Chapel Ground) (as per the attached site plan- which details a larger HELAA area than being proposed in the NP but it does detail the adjoining land owned, edged blue).</p> <p>Policies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Local Green Spaces - to be retained. There is opportunity to create new green spaces 2 Local Landscape Features – respect and enhance 3 Village Character – keep visual connection to countryside. This connection can be achieved through good design and masterplanning 4 Respecting the History of Puddletown – Opportunity to provide information on history. Interpretation boards could be utilised within the scheme 5 Design – good quality. Sustainable construction. Partnering with a high quality local builder is a key objective of the landowner. There may be scope to develop a small solar farm to help deliver green energy on adjoining land. 6 Wildlife and Natural Habitats – protect and enhance. There is opportunity to plant additional woodland and hedgerows 7 European and internationally protected sites 8 Flood Risk – avoid flood risk. There is the opportunity to positively deal with the localised flooding on the
--	--	--

		<p>main road.</p> <p>9 Noise assessments – required in noise sensitive areas, the proposed site is well away from the bypass, as opposed to other sites.</p> <p>10 The scale and location of new housing development in Puddletown – The Housing needs survey is already 2 years out of date and there is discussion regarding 10 dwellings per year being more appropriate, giving a target of 120 units. Para 4.1.7 identifies need for up to 84 dwellings based on growth of 7 units/year for 12 years, with provision identified for 62 units, with 22 dwellings allocated now at Chapel Ground and a further potential for an additional phase in the future of 10-12 units. Having regard to the upfront cost of infrastructure provision, and economies of scale to maximise the delivery of affordable housing, it is recommended that a larger site is allocated for approximately 60 dwellings based on the housing needs survey assessment of 10 dwellings per year, to allow for the possible future growth when the plan is reviewed in 2024. This may be considered a more sound basis for longer term planning. This will also maximise the prospect of attracting a high quality developer. We suggest the community element is not specified now but that allowance for space generally is incorporated into the masterplan to achieve the best overall design. Suggestion of min 0.2 ha of community space is possible but it should not be too prescriptive in respect of location as it could compromise the design. Provision of possible allotments is possible and extending planting along skyline is possible. Provision of more units will provide greater affordable housing and potential for community infrastructure benefits.</p> <p>11 House Types – Affordable should be 1-2 bed rent (30%), shared ownership min 5%, max 20% 4 bed plus of OM, 800 sq m village square</p> <p>12 Housing and Community uses site allocation: Chapel Ground – 35% Affordable Housing, 0.2ha community use completion prior to completion of the first dwelling, access, drainage plan, biodiversity plan, design, 800sq m village square, 600sq m allotment. We suggest that the plan should not be too prescriptive at this early stage, to ensure that subsequent design is not compromised because land has been allocated prematurely for community use.</p> <p>13 Reserve Site allocation : Northbrook Farm – 12 units. This site is in a noise sensitive site so may not be deliverable and is too small, and is more suitable to commercial uses.</p> <p>14 Supporting Community Facilities and local services</p>
--	--	---

		<p>15 Creating Safer roads and pedestrian / cycle routes - suggestion of creating some E-W connection through the preferred site, this may be possible but if no further connection to east can be agreed with other landowners then it may be unnecessary.</p> <p>16 Parking provision. There is potential to create greater community benefits and community spaces with parking with a greater number of units.</p>
14	Vanessa Moriarty	<p>I am not a knowledgeable bird watcher but do appreciate and welcome the birds that visit the area. I see herons fairly regularly but have seen kingfishers on just a handful of occasions.</p> <p>I appreciate the benefits of improving pedestrian access around the village. I note that one of the proposed “connections” (shown in pink on page 52 of the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan) is slightly north of the stream which borders the north side of my property and which I have access to.</p> <p>My thoughts are as follows:</p> <p>(1) The water meadow is an essential flood plain. If any path is built up (eg with gravel or concrete), it will diminish the effectiveness of the water meadow as a flood plain. On page 43, I note there is mention of an ‘all-weather off-road pedestrian access’. This would inhibit the ability of the water meadow to do its job and would, I believe, be an unwise move as flooding is already an issue in the area. I wish to be assured that the path will not be built up in any way.</p> <p>(2) On the few occasions that I have been privileged enough to have glimpsed a kingfisher, my dog has been indoors and I have been doing something quietly in the garden. I am aware that people and dogs will disturb the deer and birds in the meadow. Will there be restrictions on dogs? Will they have to be on leads? If so, who will enforce this please?</p> <p>(3) Has the possibility of a path around the north edge of the meadow (where it could meet the path requested for the proposed housing site) been considered?</p> <p>(4) I note on page 35 that the area north of my property will be community land. How is it envisaged that this land will be used?</p> <p>I would welcome a visit by someone from the Community Planning Team to discuss these matters.</p>

15	Keith Mason	<p><u>Objection to the inclusion of LGS4 “Catmead Green Space” in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan</u></p> <p>I am writing to express my objection in the strongest possible terms to the proposed designation of LGS4 “Catmead Green Space” in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan. My objection is relates to every instance of LGS4 in the draft Plan and all the supporting documentation that has been submitted for examination.</p> <p>I apologise for its length, but this is entirely due to the intransigence of The Steering Group (SG) in the preparation of the draft Plan and supporting documentation in relation to the proposed designation of LGS4 as well as it’s inconsistency of reasoning, misrepresentation of information and economy with the facts,</p> <p>The reasons for my objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The majority of the land in the proposed designated LGS4 is to the north of Nos 8-10 Catmead. It is a, open, lawned garden, owned and maintained at considerable expense by the Catmead Management Company Ltd (CMCL) for the exclusive use of the residents of Catmead. As a private community garden, it is or should be, outside the scope of LGS designation. 2. This is simply one of several attempts by the Parish Council to appropriate the CMCL owned land for its own purposes. Previously attempts have included its proposed use as a village dog walking “park”, having effectively banned dog walking from the recreation ground! 3. At a meeting on 23/10/2019 attended by Peter Berry and myself (Keith Mason) representing the CMCL as Directors and Peter Churchill, Chair of the Parish Council, and Janet Ranger both supposedly representing the Puddletown Local Plan Steering Group, after considerable discussion we were assured that, in view of our objections, LGS4 would be removed from the Plan. The SG subsequently reneged on this assurance without any further discussion. 4. The LGS4 site was already previously considered and discounted as a possible LLLI at the Public Enquiry into the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan. However, the Inspector’s view was that, whilst he recognised the site's visual context in relation to Puddletown, he did not feel its designation was justified. As a consequence, it has not been considered worthy of inclusion in any of the adopted Local Plans since. However, in relation only to the grassed area to the north of the 3 metre hedge, which overlooks the River Piddle, we have recognised that there is a benefit to the village that we can accommodate which is why we have allowed the Parish Council to locate a memorial seat on it. It is not difficult to predict, though, what the CMCL’s member views will be on this remaining in its current position should the proposed LGS4 be designated against the residents’ wishes. 5. If the Parish Council is truly concerned about maintaining the appearance of the village why does it choose not to properly maintain the grass spaces in its control and ownership. They are all in a shabby and poor
----	-------------	--

		<p>condition and grass only gets cut when residents complain about the lack of maintenance. This is in stark contrast to the pride that the CMCL and the Catmead residents take in its lawned community garden which is probably villagers hold it in high regard. Designation of LGS4 will see the CMCL adopt the same poor attitude to maintenance as the local authority which will result in a distinct deterioration in its current appeal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The Summary of Considerations on P12 of the Consultation Report states “Whilst it is clear from the planning history that these areas were intended to be public land, whose openness and views through would enhance the character of this part of the Conservation Area....” This is a blatant misrepresentation. If it had been intended, then it would have been a specific requirement of the planning permission or conditioned as part of the s106 relating to the footpaths across the area. It wasn’t made a requirement or a condition. 7. The LGS maps on P9 of the draft Plan and the Policies Map do not actually indicate that the publicly-owned grass verge along the east side of the Blandford Road is part of LGS4, or indeed part of any LGS. This could of course just be a drafting/labelling error. But, on the other hand, it might not, in which case it is only reasonable to assume it is intentional. If the publicly-owned land has been removed from the proposed LGS designation, as it appears to have been, then the rationale for including the CMCL land no longer stands and the proposed LGS4 should be cancelled in its entirety. 8. The LGS Assessment Spreadsheet is misrepresentative and factually incorrect in relation to LGS4: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The landscape importance is stated as “high”, but this is only because, unlike the publicly-owned land which is badly maintained by the local authority, the residents of Catmead through the CMCL pay to maintain it as such. This will not continue if LGS4 is designated. b. As privately-owned land, it actually has no recreational importance to the village at all, even though this is stated as being of “medium” value. 9. The LGS Policy is based on blatant double standards. It deliberately omits important publicly-owned green spaces at the entrances to the village in the east and west (such as the green space to the south the of the Dorchester Road in front of the C of E First School, to the south of the Athelhampton Road along the hedge row to the Chapel Ground site and the area of land by the traffic lights which hosts the village sign) in order to facilitate future 'development flexibility' whilst deliberately encumbering the private land within the proposed LGS4. This bias is highly undemocratic. 10. The delineation of the public and privately owned land is undefined in the Plan and presents significant potential for future legal disputes over its ongoing maintenance. 11. The CMCL land in LGS is a floodplain for the River Piddle along the Backwater which has proved its value over the past 15 years, preventing significant flooding in the Catmead and Home Farm developments, and is currently managed as such. Designation as an LGS will restrict our ability to quickly and easily undertake any remedial work needed in this respect. 12. The descriptions as to the reasons why LGS4 is important as outlined in the draft Plan and the Assessment Spreadsheet are contradictory and different. They are both false and inaccurate:
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The only reason that the majority of LGS4 provides a landscaped setting is that it is regularly maintained at the expense of the Catmead Management Company which is funded entirely by the residents of Catmead. This will not continue. b. The labelled parts of LGS4 are not a setback for the houses fronting the Blandford Road. c. The description of the Blandford Road as being busy, beggar’s belief. d. It doesn’t present an attractive entrance to the village as it is completely hidden by a 3 metre high hedge and is only seen fleetingly by passing vehicles. Hardly anyone enters the village on foot!! e. The Parish Council commissioned the construction of a purpose-built wooden bus stop to provide a pleasant place to wait for a bus on the Blandford Road. Waiting in this bus stop blocks any view of the Catmead lawned garden. Only the badly maintained public space can be seen. In any event, in the 15 years I have lived in the village, I have not seen more than a handful of people ever use the bus stop. And, in any case, how long will the current bus route continue in operation? f. It is not an informal place to play. The privately-owned space is for the exclusive use of the residents of Catmead. In any event, any suggestion of play next to a “busy” road, is almost certainly a future accident in the making! g. The footpaths through LGS4 do not connect through the area as the proposed connecting footpath through Home Farm has never been formally adopted and the Dorset Highways Department have previously stated that they have no intention of doing so. <p>13. Other important green spaces, notably the land on the corner of the Blandford Road and the High Street on which the village sign has been erected, and the land between the Dorchester Road and the First school, have been deliberately left out of any LGS designation so as to better facilitate potential future public development projects. On this basis, the designation of privately-owned spaces appears to be highly discriminatory.</p> <p>14. The proposed designation of LGS4 is a contravention of my human rights under Schedule 1, Article 8 of The Human Rights Act 1998 which refers to the right to respect for private and family life. Further, sub-section 2 states that there shall be no interference by a public authority, which the Plan clearly breaches.</p>
16	<p>Natural England Alison Appleby Lead Adviser Dorset West Team Wessex Area Team</p>	<p>We are supportive of Policy 1 which seeks to protect the green character of local green spaces and Policy 2 which recognises the local landscape features and seeks their retention and where possible enhancement.</p> <p>Turning to Chapter 3 (The Environment), within Policy 6 we welcome recognition of the Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plans and the work that has been done to identify the existing and potential wildlife areas within the parish. The neighbourhood plan should seek to deliver net gain as a result of any development.</p>

		<p>Policy 7 covers European and internationally protected sites. As we have some specific advice around that policy which comes under the auspices of the Habitats Regulations, that advice is under a separate section below.</p> <p>Within Chapter 7 (traffic and transport), we welcome the aspiration to provide new access routes in parts of the village to promote walking over driving and also promote healthy lifestyles and better connect up the existing public rights of way.</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) – screening and appropriate assessment requirements</p> <p>The Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan Habitats Regulation Assessment (Feb 2020) submitted to Natural England by Dorset Council has concluded that a likely significant effect on international sites is likely and has completed an Appropriate Assessment (AA) accordingly. The AA considers the mitigation measures necessary to ensure the plan does not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the international sites and recommends policy wording that has been incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan Policy 7. Please note only where a neighbourhood plan can show conformity with Chapter 8 of the Habitats Regulations (as amended) can it progress.</p> <p>The submitted AA of the Neighbourhood Plan relies on the mitigation measures set out in the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD and the Poole Harbour Nutrient Reduction SPD to ensure the proposals have no adverse effect on the integrity of the International Sites. The following comments are intended to inform the AA for the Puddletown NP:</p> <p>Natural England agrees with the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan HRA Screening Assessment (Feb 2020).</p> <p>Natural England agrees with the conclusions set out in the appropriate assessment that adverse impacts to the Dorset Heaths / Dorset Heathlands European Sites can be avoided through adherence of the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD.</p> <p>Natural England has requested a review of the mitigation measures through the provisions of the Poole Harbour Nutrient Reduction SPD. The review was completed recently and has demonstrated that sufficient permanent nitrogen offsetting has been provided for the development that was permitted in 2017 to 2019 and is now built out,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>or under construction.</p> <p>However, a further 75.66 hectares of offsetting land, or other equivalent measures, is now needed to offset the remaining schemes permitted in that period but which have not yet commenced. This represents a significant backlog of mitigation requirements that now need addressing and raises some uncertainty about whether future permissions or allocations for residential development that rely on the SPD will meet the nitrogen offsetting requirements prior to occupation. Given the current deficit of nitrogen offsetting measures Natural England recommends the AA for the NP considers whether additional safeguards are now needed within the Policy 7 to ensure that development cannot commence until the Competent Authority is satisfied that sufficient nitrogen offsetting measures have been secured through the SPD, or other suitable mechanisms, to ensure the new developments will achieve nitrogen neutrality by first occupation.</p> <p>An approach suggested elsewhere for impacts on internationally designated sites with a similar set of circumstances involved the following Neighbourhood Plan Policy wording:</p> <p>“Development will be required to confirm the nitrogen budget and set out specific and</p> <p>appropriately located mitigation measures that would be implemented in order to ensure that development is nutrient neutral from the start of its operational phase. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development's effects. A financial contribution to strategic mitigation measures may be an appropriate alternative to direct provision of mitigation. In this case it will be necessary to liaise with Dorset Council and Natural England to confirm an appropriate mitigation scheme to which the contributions will be directed and to ensure any contributions are sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the Poole Harbour internationally designated sites”.</p> <p>The Appropriate Assessment should also consider whether the necessary level of mitigation required by the allocated development within the plan can be wholly or partly secured through the provision of permanent land use change within the Neighbourhood Plan area. This might be achieved by the NP allocating additional agricultural land for land uses with a low nutrient status that will also be of benefit to the local community and/or biodiversity interests (eg community woodland, community orchards, nature reserve, new wetlands, or other similar green infrastructure including SANG) and thereby provide certainty that the appropriate level of nitrogen offsetting will be secured to enable the development identified within the NP.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The NP proposes some 60 new dwellings, the Plan Group should seek confirmation from Dorset Council that there is no policy conflict with this number of dwellings coming forward without an identified Heathland Infrastructure Project. Dorset Council have a wider overview of development coming forward. It appears to Natural England that a very small number of dwellings might come forward within the 5km area from the Dorset Heathlands.</p> <p>Natural England is aware of recent policy adjustments required at the Purbeck Local Plan. The examiner has required that reference to SPDs should not be made within plan policies. The group should seek the advice of Dorset Council on this matter (policies 7, 12 and 18 refer to SPDs).</p>
17	Peter Berry	<p>Objection to the designation and inclusion of Catmead land as LGS4 in the PNP.</p> <p>I write to object vehemently to the proposed inclusion of Catmead land as LGS4 "Catmead Green Space" in the PNP.</p> <p>There are considerable inconsistencies in the wordings in Puddletown Area Neighbourhood Plan (Draft) regarding LGS4 and the Supporting Evidences LGS Assessment.</p> <p>All of the Catmead land being proposed as LGS4 is Private Land, owned jointly and severally by all of the Freeholders of the Catmead houses. The land is managed for and by the Freeholders via Catmead Management Company Limited (CMCL) the directors of which, must be freeholders. Every freeholder is a member of CMCL.</p> <p>The main area of LGS4 is our private grass area fronting Nos 1-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10 Catmead, maintained superbly by and at the sole considerable expense of us residents. It is our private communal garden. If our control over our private communal garden is removed by inclusion as Catmead Green Space LGS4, I and other residents will not be minded to fund the expensive upkeep. The land will revert to an untidy state matching the poorly maintained publicly owned wide verges adjacent along the Blandford road</p> <p>The Dorset Council website still shows: PNP/Consultation on submitted plan/Supporting evidence/Local green space assessment/ under main reasons/description of why important/4-Catmead grass space/ "This green space provides a landscaped setting for the houses fronting on to the busy Blandford road, creating an attractive entrance into the village and a pleasant space to wait at the bus stop and for informal play".</p> <p>Catmead green space does not provide a landscaped setting for the houses fronting Blandford road, if so, why isn't LGS4 called Blandford Road Green Space, all they see is scruffy poorly maintained public grass verge. Catmead lawns are well behind the bus stop and cannot be seen if in the bus shelter. Informal play!!! next to a busy main road</p>

		<p>is asking for and accident. The public verge is not defined sufficiently on the plan and this will encourage informal play on private Catmead lawns that will encourage trespass and result in confrontations requiring law enforcement.</p> <p>Local Green Space Consultation October 2019</p> <p>Page 12./Catmead/Summary of consideration:</p> <p>Quote..... "the open nature of the northern part". This is an incorrect statement, the northern part is hidden mainly by a 3m high hedge, you do not see the Catmead lawns until you have virtually walked past, even less so if driving. The northern part is grass verge.</p> <p>Quote....."Whilst it is clear from the planning history that these areas were intended to be public land". This is not true, an antagonistic statement serving no purpose and has no place within this plan. It is not clear, there are no specific clauses or paragraphs pertaining to that. Had there been, the land would be public now. The land is private and that will not change. This statement by the SG has no place in the summary of considerations, it is irrelevant, not true and hints of sour grapes by the Steering Group whose chairman is also Parish council chair. There has been a past attempt by the parish council to sequester Catmead lawns for dog walking after the council themselves restricted dog walking in the recreation ground.</p> <p>As such, being private, the criterion of "demonstrably special" or "of particular significance" within the terms of NPPF are not met. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF advises that designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or spaces.</p> <p>The proposed LGS4 is not "demonstrably special" to the local community within the terms of NPPF, being private communal lawns, the area is not accessible to "the local community at large". The tarmac public footpath through it is only used infrequently and It is not of "particular significance" within the terms of NPPF, its only significance at present is that it is superbly well kept by us at our expense.</p> <p>At the very early stages, the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group did not contact CMCL to discuss or explain the full implications of designation. Having looked at neighbourhood plan details for many other villages they all appeared to have understood and ensured that very early communication and discussion/explanation was paramount. The Steering Group appear to be insular, dogmatic and not to be trusted. Harsh words maybe but upheld by the following:</p>
--	--	---

		<p>After a lengthy objection letter from CMCL 18 October 2019 to the Steering Group (SG), the parish clerk replied by email on 19 October 2019 11:09hrs. The last paragraph of that email reads:</p> <p><i>"I have recommended to the group" (meaning the SG) "that they either remove the land which is owned by CMCL from the list of land for LGS designation (a disappointing but easy and quick solution) or request a meeting with the directors so that this can be discussed before moving forward as if you fully understand the intentions here then I cannot comprehend your position".</i></p> <p>A meeting was swiftly arranged by CMCL for 23 October 2019, held at Catmead, attended by Keith Mason and Peter Berry (Directors of CMCL) with Peter Churchill (chairman of SG) and Janet Ranger (SG member). After lengthy discussion it was specifically agreed at that meeting by the SG attendees that LGS4 would be removed from the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The SG subsequently on 18 November 2019 wrote to CMCL advising that <i>"Catmead Green Space remains one of the several areas due to be designated as LGS in Puddletown"</i>. No mention what so ever was made about the 23 October 2019 meeting or the SG chairmans/members specific agreement to remove LGS4.</p> <p>8 January 2020, CMCL wrote to the parish clerk complaining saying:</p> <p><i>"This kind of behaviour, saying one thing and doing the opposite, particularly by the chairman of the SG is not acceptable. We are not confident that opportunities to make further representations will be considered in an unbiased manner."</i></p> <p>No reply has ever been received to our letter of 8 January 2020.</p> <p>The LGS4 Assessment spreadsheets are incorrect regarding LGS4. Landscape importance is shown as High only because the residents pay for the quality maintenance. If designated an LGS, this expenditure will cease. Also it shows recreational value as Medium. There is no recreational value to the village, the land is private.</p> <p>The public footpath through Catmead and on through Home farm is not a public footpath on Home farm side as it is not adopted Home Farm side and Dorset Highways Dept have said in the past they have no intention of adopting it. Connecting public footpaths therefore do not exist through Catmead so the PNP is ambiguous.</p> <p>Schedule 1. Article 8. of The Human Rights Act refers to "Right to respect for private family life" and sub section 2.</p>
--	--	--

Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – August 2020

		<p>states "There shall be no interference by a Public Authority". There is a breach here that we may need to seek action against if LGS4 is not removed.</p> <p>I ask as below because your server has been down (a 503 error ??),</p> <p>I would appreciate acknowledgement of your receipt of this email. Also, an assurance that all correspondence/copies of emails from Catmead residents and CMCL will be available in full to the independent examiner.</p>
18	Iain Lavender and Anne Roberts	<p>Further to your letter date 26th June 2020 we wish to lodge a formal objection to the proposed Development put forward in the Puddletown Area Neighbourhood Plan. As residents of The Chapel, Athelhampton Road the development would severely affect us in an extremely negative way.</p> <p>We purchased the property 3 years ago and apart from liking the property itself, one of the main reasons for purchasing the property was because of the quiet location and the view across the fields to Little Knoll cove at the back. The view of the field alternates every other year with livestock to arable and we regularly see deer.</p> <p>During the time we have lived here we have invested a lot of money into the property both internally and externally paying particular attention to the rear garden which leads up to the field.</p> <p>Athelhampton Road is a quiet road with very little through traffic and it is a popular cycle route. This would change for the worse with traffic coming in and out of the entrance to the road which is planned to be right beside our property.</p> <p>Having looked at the proposed plan there would be a semi-detached property with gardens to these properties directly up to our rear boundary. The field is on a gradient upwards, thus the houses would overlook our property and garden and not only would we lose the main view we would also completely lose our privacy too.</p> <p>We notice that our property is marked on your plans as “Locally Important Buildings”, yet the proposal is to build new modern style properties right up to our rear boundaries.</p> <p>There is a field on the opposite side of Milom Lane, directly behind the Puddletown Doctors surgery, which if built on would not affect any dwellings.</p>

		We would like our objection noted and wish to be kept informed of the progress of the plan.
19	Anne Williams	<p>I would like to register my outright objection to the inclusion of the proposed LGS4 in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><u>Objection to the inclusion of LGS4 “Catmead Green Space” in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan</u></p> <p>I am writing to express my objection in the strongest possible terms to the proposed designation of LGS4 “Catmead Green Space” in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan. My objection is relates to every instance of LGS4 in the draft Plan and all the supporting documentation that has been submitted for examination.</p> <p>I apologise for its length, but this is entirely due to the intransigence of The Steering Group (SG) in the preparation of the draft Plan and supporting documentation in relation to the proposed designation of LGS4 as well as it’s inconsistency of reasoning, misrepresentation of information and economy with the facts,</p> <p>The reasons for my objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The majority of the land in the proposed designated LGS4 is to the north of Nos 8-10 Catmead. It is a, open, lawned garden, owned and maintained at considerable expense by the Catmead Management Company Ltd (CMCL) for the exclusive use of the residents of Catmead. As a private community garden, it is or should be, outside the scope of LGS designation. 2. This is simply one of several attempts by the Parish Council to appropriate the CMCL owned land for its own purposes. Previously attempts have included its proposed use as a village dog walking “park”, having effectively banned dog walking from the recreation ground! 3. At a meeting on 23/10/2019 between the parish council and the CMCL we were assured that, in view of our objections, LGS4 would be removed from the Plan. The SG subsequently reneged on this assurance without any further discussion. 4. The LGS4 site was already previously considered and discounted as a possible LLLI at the Public Enquiry into the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan. However, the Inspector’s view was that, whilst he recognised the site's visual context in relation to Puddletown, he did not feel its designation was justified. As a consequence, it has not been considered worthy of inclusion in any of the adopted Local Plans since. However, in relation only to the grassed area to the north of the 3 metre hedge, which overlooks the River Piddle, we have recognised that there is a benefit to the village that we can accommodate which is why we have allowed the Parish Council to locate a memorial seat on it. It is not difficult to predict, though, what the CMCL’s member views will be on this remaining in its current position should the proposed LGS4 be

		<p>designated against the residents’ wishes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. If the Parish Council is truly concerned about maintaining the appearance of the village why does it choose not to properly maintain the grass spaces in its control and ownership. They are all in a shabby and poor condition and grass only gets cut when residents complain about the lack of maintenance. This is in stark contrast to the pride that the CMCL and the Catmead residents take in its lawned community garden which is probably villagers hold it in high regard. Designation of LGS4 will see the CMCL adopt the same poor attitude to maintenance as the local authority which will result in a distinct deterioration in its current appeal. 6. The Summary of Considerations on P12 of the Consultation Report states “Whilst it is clear from the planning history that these areas were intended to be public land, whose openness and views through would enhance the character of this part of the Conservation Area...” This is a blatant misrepresentation. If it had been intended, then it would have been a specific requirement of the planning permission or conditioned as part of the s106 relating to the footpaths across the area. It wasn’t made a requirement or a condition. 7. The LGS maps on P9 of the draft Plan and the Policies Map do not actually indicate that the publicly-owned grass verge along the east side of the Blandford Road is part of LGS4, or indeed part of any LGS. This could of course just be a drafting/labelling error. But, on the other hand, it might not, in which case it is only reasonable to assume it is intentional. If the publicly-owned land has been removed from the proposed LGS designation, as it appears to have been, then the rationale for including the CMCL land no longer stands and the proposed LGS4 should be cancelled in its entirety. 8. The LGS Assessment Spreadsheet is misrepresentative and factually incorrect in relation to LGS4: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The landscape importance is stated as “high”, but this is only because, unlike the publicly-owned land which is badly maintained by the local authority, the residents of Catmead through the CMCL pay to maintain it as such. This will not continue if LGS4 is designated. b. As privately-owned land, it actually has no recreational importance to the village at all, even though this is stated as being of “medium” value. 9. The LGS Policy is based on blatant double standards. It deliberately omits important publicly-owned green spaces at the entrances to the village in the east and west (such as the green space to the south the of the Dorchester Road in front of the C of E First School, to the south of the Athelhampton Road along the hedge row to the Chapel Ground site and the area of land by the traffic lights which hosts the village sign) in order to facilitate future 'development flexibility' whilst deliberately encumbering the private land within the proposed LGS4. This bias is highly undemocratic. 10. The delineation of the public and privately owned land is undefined in the Plan and presents significant potential for future legal disputes over its ongoing maintenance. 11. The CMCL land in LGS is a floodplain for the River Piddle along the Backwater which has proved its value over the past 15 years, preventing significant flooding in the Catmead and Home Farm developments, and is currently managed as such. Designation as an LGS will restrict our ability to quickly and easily undertake any
--	--	--

		<p>remedial work needed in this respect.</p> <p>12. The descriptions as to the reasons why LGS4 is important as outlined in the draft Plan and the Assessment Spreadsheet are contradictory and different. They are both false and inaccurate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The only reason that the majority of LGS4 provides a landscaped setting is that it is regularly maintained at the expense of the Catmead Management Company which is funded entirely by the residents of Catmead. This will not continue. b. The labelled parts of LGS4 are not a setback for the houses fronting the Blandford Road. c. The description of the Blandford Road as being busy, beggar’s belief. d. It doesn’t present an attractive entrance to the village as it is completely hidden by a 3 metre high hedge and is only seen fleetingly by passing vehicles. Hardly anyone enters the village on foot!! e. The Parish Council commissioned the construction of a purpose-built wooden bus stop to provide a pleasant place to wait for a bus on the Blandford Road. Waiting in this bus stop blocks any view of the Catmead lawned garden. Only the badly maintained public space can be seen. In any event, in the 15 years I have lived in the village, I have not seen more than a handful of people ever use the bus stop. And, in any case, how long will the current bus route continue in operation? f. It is not an informal place to play. The privately-owned space is for the exclusive use of the residents of Catmead. In any event, any suggestion of play next to a “busy” road, is almost certainly a future accident in the making! g. The footpaths through LGS4 do not connect through the area as the proposed connecting footpath through Home Farm has never been formally adopted and the Dorset Highways Department have previously stated that they have no intention of doing so. <p>13. Other important green spaces, notably the land on the corner of the Blandford Road and the High Street on which the village sign has been erected, and the land between the Dorchester Road and the First school, have been deliberately left out of any LGS designation so as to better facilitate potential future public development projects. On this basis, the designation of privately-owned spaces appears to be highly discriminatory.</p> <p>14. The proposed designation of LGS4 is a contravention of my human rights under Schedule 1, Article 8 of The Human Rights Act 1998 which refers to the right to respect for private and family life. Further, sub-section 2 states that there shall be no interference by a public authority, which the Plan clearly breaches.</p>
20	Ray Stephens	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has an aspiration for new footpaths/bridleways.</p> <p>As one of the landowners who will be affected by one of the proposed routes (namely the route linking the Backwater with Athelhampton Rd), it is a shame that at no stage has the Neighbourhood Plan Group had the courtesy</p>

		<p>to approach or discuss with us this planned route and we have confirmed, on seeing the draft prior to submission to DCC, that we would <u>not</u> allow this proposal across our land.</p> <p>Furthermore in January '20 we requested that this be removed from further iterations of the plan.</p> <p>We are disappointed to see that our wishes have not been undertaken. This potentially casts doubt on other content in the plan - if affected landowners have not been fully consulted over aspirations and if these wishes are just pipedreams they seem pointless to include in any future plans.</p> <p>Where landowners wishes have clearly confirmed that indicative proposals are not possible they should be deleted to ensure the plan has validity and purpose.</p>
21	Christine Berry	<p>I write to object to the inclusion of Catmead land as LGS4 "Catmead Green Space" in the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan (PNP)</p> <p>There are considerable inconsistencies in the wordings in Puddletown Area Neighbourhood Plan (Draft) regarding LGS4 and the Supporting Evidences LGS Assessment.</p> <p>The main area of LGS4 is our private grass area, well maintained by and at the sole expense of us residents. It is our private communal garden. If our control over our private communal garden is removed by inclusion as Catmead Green Space LGS4, I and other residents will not be minded to fund the expensive upkeep. The land will revert to an untidy state matching the poorly maintained publicly owned adjacent grass areas along the Blandford road</p> <p>The Dorset Council website still shows: PNP/Consultation on submitted plan/Supporting evidence/Local green space assessment/ under main reasons/description of why important/4-Catmead grass space/ "This green space provides a landscaped setting for the houses fronting on to the busy Blandford road, creating an attractive entrance into the village and a pleasant space to wait at the bus stop and for informal play".</p> <p>Catmead green space does not provide a landscaped setting for the houses fronting Blandford road, if so, why isn't LGS4 called Blandford Road Green Space, all they see is scruffy poorly maintained public grass verge. Catmead lawns are well behind the bus stop and cannot be seen if in the bus shelter. Informal play!!! next to a busy main road is asking for an accident. The public verge is not defined sufficiently on the plan and this will encourage informal play on private Catmead lawns that will encourage trespass and result in confrontations requiring.</p>

		<p>Local Green Space Consultation October 2019</p> <p>Page 12./Catmead/Summary of consideration:</p> <p>"the open nature of the northern part". This is an incorrect, the northern part is hidden mainly by a 3m high hedge, you do not see the Catmead lawns until you have virtually walked past, less so if driving. The northern part is grass verge only.</p> <p>The Summary of consideration further says:</p> <p>"Whilst it is clear from the planning history that these areas were intended to be public land".</p> <p>It is not clear, had it been, the land would be public now, it is not. This statement by the SG has no place in the summary of considerations. What is clear is that the SG are appear to be aggrieved that the Catmead land is not public space and are doing any thing can to gain some control over it.</p> <p>As such, being private, the criterion of "demonstrably special" or "of particular significance" within the terms of NPPF are not met. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF advises that designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or spaces.</p> <p>The proposed LGS4 is not "demonstrably special" to the local community within the terms of NPPF, being private communal lawns, the area is not accessible to "the local community at large". The tarmac public footpath through it is only used infrequently and it is not of "particular significance" within the terms of NPPF, its only significance at present is that it is superbly well kept by us at our expense.</p> <p>At the very early stages, the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group did not contact CMCL to discuss or explain the full implications of designation. Having looked at neighbourhood plan details for many other villages they all appeared to have understood and ensured that very early communication and discussion/explanation was paramount. The Steering Group appear to be insular and not to be trusted. Harsh words but upheld by the following:</p> <p>After a lengthy objection letter from CMCL 18 October 2019 to the Steering Group (SG), the parish clerk replied by email on 19 October 2019 11:09hrs. The last paragraph of that email reads:</p> <p><i>"I have recommended to the group" (meaning the SG) "that they either remove the land which is owned by CMCL</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>from the list of land for LGS designation (a disappointing but easy and quick solution) or request a meeting with the directors so that this can be discussed before moving forward as if you fully understand the intentions here then I cannot comprehend your position".</i></p> <p>A meeting was swiftly arranged by CMCL for 23 October 2019, held at Catmead, attended by two Directors of CMCL with the chairman of SG) and an SG member). I understand from those Directors that it was specifically agreed at that meeting by the SG attendees that LGS4 would be removed from the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The SG subsequently on 18 November 2019 wrote to CMCL advising that <i>"Catmead Green Space remains one of the several areas due to be designated as LGS in Puddletown"</i>. No mention what so ever was made about the 23 October 2019 meeting or the SG chairmans/members specific agreement to remove LGS4.</p> <p>8 January 2020, CMCL wrote to the parish clerk complaining saying:</p> <p><i>"This kind of behaviour, saying one thing and doing the opposite, particularly by the chairman of the SG is not acceptable. We are not confident that opportunities to make further representations will be considered in an unbiased manner."</i></p> <p>No reply has ever been received to our letter of 8 January 2020.</p> <p>The LGS4 Assessment spreadsheets are incorrect regarding LGS4.</p> <p>The public footpath through Catmead does not connect through. Home Farm side is not adopted and Dorset Highways Dept have said in the past they have no intention of adopting it. Connecting public footpaths therefore do not exist through Catmead so the PNP is incorrect. Schedule 1. Article 8. of The Human Rights Act refers to "Right to respect for private family life" and sub section 2. states "There shall be no interference by a Public Authority".</p> <p>There is clearly interference</p>
22	Robert and Debby Thomas-Orchard	<p>We have been residents of Puddletown for 25 years.</p> <p>We are happy to note from the Plan that you ask developers to use the latest information on flood risk to ensure that development does not take place in the flood areas or worsen flooding off-site, however do have some concerns regarding the development at Northbrook Farm, which we will detail below.</p>

		<p>Druce Road (in front of the Moor Cottages) becomes submerged when the River Piddle floods. We note from the plan that an all-weather off-road pedestrian path will be created across this open space to link to Druce Lane, prior to the occupation of the first dwelling – our concern being that the all-weather off-road (or possibly raised) pedestrian path that is due to be created would possibly exacerbate the flooding on Druce Lane (The Moor). Also, as we’ve mentioned, Druce Lane becomes submerged when The Piddle floods and is not safe to walk along it, are you also planning an all weather off-road (possibly raised) pedestrian path for Druce Lane – if so, we would have the same concerns that it will block or impede the floodwater from its natural channel and exacerbate the flooding.</p> <p>The floodwater has reached approximately 15 foot from the front of our home, we are concerned that anything that impedes the rivers natural flow when flooded will force this closer, and possibly into our home.</p> <p>Also, the watermeadow/floodplain behind The Moor Cottages floods, and we have the same concerns - that any hardstanding (or raised) all weather paths will exacerbate the flooding, and force water closer to, and possibly into our home.</p> <p>Any pedestrian paths that are constructed cannot impede or block the floodwater, or have a negative impact on the effectiveness of the watermeadow.</p> <p>We note that with regards development at Northbrook – To ensure that “A drainage plan is secured to manage groundwater and surface water disposal from the site without discharge to the A35 highway drainage system, and in accordance with Policy 8” – if it is not to the A35 drainage system, where will the surface water disposal be discharged – hopefully not the area already at high risk of flooding, Druce Lane. We note elsewhere in the plan that it is mentioned “Any drainage plan, where required, should assess, and where feasible and appropriate, incorporate, opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding below current levels..” – hopefully this will be the case with Northbrook Farm.</p> <p>We note and are happy to read the comments in the plan that large expanses of tarmac can give an overly urban impression so this must be avoided; hopefully if/when building is completed at Northbrook, it will have the minimum hardstanding and tarmac, to enable ground water to soak away, to ensure that that development does not exacerbate the flooding on Druce Lane</p>
23	David Stuart Historic England	Thank you for your Regulation 16 consultation on the submitted version of the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan.

		<p>In our response to the Regulation 14 consultation we highlighted to the community the need for further evidence to substantiate policies 12, 13 & 14 (see attached) and suggested it liaise with your authority’s heritage team.</p> <p>We note from the Plan and its associated documents that the community has subsequently been in liaison with your authority’s heritage team and that the site proposals now submitted are promoted as being in accordance with the heritage advice offered.</p> <p>We remain happy to defer to that advice and would therefore only request that your authority confirm to itself that the Plan and its documents as submitted are an appropriate reflection of what was previously advised and agreed in that liaison.</p> <p>We have no other comments to offer on the Plan.</p>
24	Chris Wanstall Weatherbury Planning & Design on behalf of Wakely Cox	<p>I am the agent for the site at Northbrook Farm which has been allocated as a reserve site under this draft plan.</p> <p>Whilst of course we support its allocation in the draft plan and the majority of the policies contained in it, it is strongly felt that the Northbrook Site should be the preferred options site, with the site at Athelhampton Road as the reserve site. There are several details and statements made in the draft plan, together with the supporting documents that are inaccurate and it would seem our comments made about them during the pre-submission consultation have not been considered in this draft version, I will summarise these below :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site area for the proposed development it would appear has been reduced by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group with no discussions with the landowners or myself - the paddock area to the east of the site has been removed. <p>The site was originally submitted to West Dorset District Council for their call for sites in 2016 and is listed in the SHLAA under reference WD/PUDD/007. The site was again submitted as part of the call for site for the Neighbourhood Plan in 2017 – including the paddock area.</p> <p>This was then presented at the Three-day Neighbourhood Plan Design Meeting for the parish which took place in September 2017 – this is detailed in the ‘Three-Day Design Forum Final Presentation’ document found in the supporting documents section. Page 86 details the site area submitted in the call for sites, with a concluded concept plan located on page 268. The whole site is detailed again on a plan in the ‘SEA Screening Report’ March 2018 with an approximate number of units as 20-30, on page 7 The ‘SEA Final Report’ dated Nov 2019 & May 2020 addendum states on page 37 that “the area proposed in the neighbourhood plan has not included the</p>

		<p>area to the east (as this was not put forward in response to the call for sites and was considered likely to have a greater impact on the setting of the listed farmhouse)”</p> <p>As demonstrated above this statement is incorrect, the site was put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan’s ‘Call for Sites’. Whilst we would agree the area to the east would have a greater impact on the setting of the listed building than the farm yard, with careful and considered design we do feel a solution could be found to allow some small scale housing in the paddock area (8-12units) away from the listed building, without causing significant harm to the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>It does concern us greatly as to why the paddock has not also been included and why the consultants would say this was not put forward as it can clearly be demonstrated that it was?</p> <p>2. The open space proposed to the south was only proposed as part of the development of the yard and the paddock. As well as providing public open space, there is also a proposed footpath and cycle links to the rest of the village. It is also likely through design that some sort of SuDS attenuation pond will be located in that area. On page 42 in the draft NP it states “The landowner has made it clear that they will arrange for the transfer of the area land between the site and Druce Lane to the community (either the Parish Council or a suitable community trust) as part of the site’s development.”</p> <p>From speaking with the landowners on this point, no commitments have been made that the landowners will arrange transfer of ownership to any party yet. All that has been discussed was this land is allocated for Public Open Space to be used for the benefit of the community, as part of the development of the whole site. There are different models of ownership and public space management which need to be considered further by the landowners.</p> <p>Further, on page 62 it states “The landowner has made clear that the land to the south (the flood risk area) would be made available as an amenity to the village provided at least 10 dwellings are achieved.”</p> <p>Again, to my knowledge no discussions have taken place with the landowners and certainly no commitments have been made by the landowners on the minimum number of dwellings that would be need in order to provide the area to the south as amenity to the village. The only discussions that have taken place was at the Three-day design meeting where the plan for the whole site was presented as detailed in the ‘Three-Day Design Forum Final Presentation’ document - Page 86.</p> <p>So again, we are not sure why these statements have been made?</p> <p>3. The site at the time of the three-day design meeting was under probate so no exact timescales could be given as to when the land would become available for release.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>It was confirmed to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering group by Mr Wakely Cox on the evening of Tuesday 3rd December at the 2-day public Exhibition, and in writing that the site was no longer in probate and was able to come forward immediately.</p> <p>At the Public Exhibition we had been advised by the Neighbourhood Steering Group that following the public consultation they would have a meeting with ourselves to discuss the site further, but this never happened, and no meeting took place.</p> <p>Para4.3.12 in the draft NP states <i>“As there is some uncertainty over the timescale over which this site may become available, the noise mitigation required, and because the allocation on Land at Athelhampton Road should provide sufficient housing to meet the anticipated needs in the plan period, this site has been allocated as a reserve site for the period beyond 2024 (when the Neighbourhood Plan is expected to be reviewed).”</i></p> <p>This statement is incorrect, there is no uncertainty in timescale, and this was confirmed as stated above, during the consultation period, the site is available now, so we are unsure why this draft still makes that statement?</p> <p>4. Regarding Noise, we have had a Stage 1 ProPG Assessment carried out over the whole site, as put forward under the call for sites, which concludes that development is possible on the site so long as good acoustic design is implemented.</p> <p>They have recommended a solid screen along the northern boundary, such as a brick wall or a close boarded timber fence – this would be within the site and not on highways land. They have recommended single storey buildings placed closer to the A35 on the higher ground, these buildings will also provide screening effects to the dwellings located further south. They have recommended other measure which would be implemented within the design of the site.</p> <p>5. Regarding the inclusion of the stable block and threshing barn as ‘locally important buildings’ on page 17.</p> <p>There seems to be little evidence in the plan for including these as locally important building other than they are old barns located in the area at Northbrook Farm to be developed.</p> <p>We would question why other buildings with just as much historic and architectural value, have not also been listed as ‘locally important buildings’.</p> <p>There are too many to name all of them, but some examples are Manor Farm Cottages on Waterson Lane or even at Northbrook farm itself, the rows of farm workers cottages, these all date from the same time as the barns?</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Further para 4.3.9 states “The Conservation Officer has advised that the remaining elements of the Threshing Barn within the site is of historic interest (this has been added to the list in Table 3, but may, subject to further research, be considered Listed as part of the curtilage of Stafford Park Farm House).”</p> <p>We are just in the process of submitting a Permitted Development application for agricultural to residential conversion on the Threshing Barn to 2 dwellings and the above statement did concern us. As such we have now had an expert consultant review this and they have concluded, like us, that the Threshing Barn should not be regarded as curtilage listed to Stafford Park Farmhouse. I have attached a copy of their letter for reference that is included in the Prior Notification Application.</p> <p>6. Regarding affordable housing, para 4.3.11 in the draft Np states that “<i>The provision of some affordable housing on this site is important given the local housing needs (and at over 0.5ha the site would be considered ‘major’ development), although it is accepted that some flexibility may be needed if this impacts on the scheme’s viability.</i>”</p> <p>However policy 13, para f.), goes onto state “<i>The type and size of dwellings accords with Policy 11, with at least 35% of the homes provided as genuinely affordable dwellings.</i>”</p> <p>Policy 13, para f.) does not allow for flexibility, even though the policy text recognises that this may possibly needed, therefore it is recommended that any application should be accompanied by an Affordable Housing Viability Assessment.</p> <p>As you can see from the above there are some inaccuracies within the draft plan, especially that the consultants have said the paddock area was not included in the Call For Sites, which it clearly was and was discussed by the whole village at the three-day design meeting – where it received tremendous support. It is our believe that the site as put forward under the call for sites can easily accommodate the 22 units that are proposed at the Athelhampton Road site. Therefore our reasoning for Northbrook as the preferred site is:-</p> <p>1. The site contains a large amount of previously developed land (mostly in agricultural use) within the yard. Whilst the paddock is greenfield land it is bound on all sides by roads (Long Lane, Blandford Road & A35) so any development will be contained.</p> <p>The site at Athelhampton Road is all greenfield land, in open countryside and is not contained.</p> <p>Previously developed land (even in agricultural use) should always be considered first over open countryside.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>2. Right from the start of the Neighbourhood Plan Process all the villagers commented on traffic through the village as a major concern, especially along the High Street. This is evident from para 7.1.1 in the draft NP which state “Traffic and safety on the local roads are a concern for residents of Puddletown. The two main routes through the village – the High Street and, to a lesser extent, Blandford Road”.</p> <p>The proposed site at Athelhampton Road will only add to the traffic along both the High Street and Blandford Road considerably more than the proposed development at Northbrook would.</p> <p>Northbrook has access straight onto the A35 or the A354, without going through the centre of the village. Both Schools are within walking distance so it is not considered that they will add any additional extra pressure at school drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>Further the site at Northbrook is on the bus route and is within 200m of the nearest bus stop.</p> <p>3. Noise can be mitigated through design</p> <p>4. Impact on heritage assets can again be mitigated by careful design – Stafford Park Farm House, which is the listed building could actually benefit by some sensitively designed building and landscaping.</p> <p>5. The site has very low visibility and maintains the open nature of the village which the neighbourhood plan seeks to do. The Defined Development Boundary (DDB) could easily be increased to include the proposed development site as shown in the sketch below. There would be no fear of the land to the south been developed as this would be Public Open Space and located in the Flood Risk Zone:-</p> <p>6. The Public Open Space would be an additional feature for all the village to enjoy so would itself be a community asset. This would also aid in providing a footpath and cycle link connecting the rest of the development to the village.</p> <p>7. By having the greenfield site at Athelhampton Road as the ‘reserve site’, if for any reason the Northbrook Site does not come forward by 2024 or through the planning process the number of units is less than 22, then the reserve site at Athelhampton Road could come forward.</p> <p>To conclude the site is available now, any noise issue can be mitigated through careful design and with the inclusion of the paddock, as per the ‘Call for Site’ and the previous Design Consultations the site could easily accommodate the 22 units proposed and potentially a few more if needed.</p> <p>This is detailed above in section 4., but to summarise: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Northbrook Site should be the preferred options site (so should change to policy 12) 2. The Athelhampton Road Site should be the reserve site (so should change to policy 13)
--	--	--

Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – August 2020

		<p>3. Draft Policy 13. F.) should remove reference to “at least 35% affordable housing” to Northbrook and should be replaced with an ‘Affordable Housing Viability Assessment’.</p> <p>4. The Threshing Barn and Stables should be removed from the list of ‘Locally Important Buildings’ – table 3.</p> <p>5. Map 7. Should be amended to include the land already within the DDB, that has been removed, and should include Northbrook as the Preferred Options Site – as indicated above. This should include the paddock as put forward in the call for sites. The land at Athelhampton Road should be indicated as the reserve site.</p>
25	Charles Clayson	<p>As far as I am aware, the requirements for an area to be classified as a Local Green Space include the use of the area for recreational purposes.</p> <p>The land managed by the Catmead Management Company Limited is private, maintained entirely at the expense of the residents of Catmead, and not available for use by other than Catmead residents apart from the public right of way footpaths crossing the green space between the Catmead housing and the Backwater road.</p> <p>It is not, therefore, available for use by the public for recreational purposes and should not be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Omit this area of land from LGS4</p>
26	Dorset Council Comments	<p><u>Chapter 1: Introduction</u></p> <p>Plan Period</p> <p>Paragraph 1.1.12 and front cover state that the plan period will run from 2019 (when it was drafted) to 2031. Dorset Council support this proposed timeframe as it matches the Adopted West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan 2015.</p> <p>Monitoring & Review</p> <p>Paragraph 1.1.13 outlines the monitoring arrangements for the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan including indicators used for an annual review.</p> <p>Dorset Council considers that monitoring and reviewing plans is important to ascertain whether or not policies are effective and to determine if actions or projects are being achieved.</p>

Chapter 2: Local landscape character and the built environment

Policy 1. Local Green Spaces

Dorset Council is supportive of Policy 1 that cross refers to Table 1 which lists ten local green space designations alongside the reasons for their designation. The accompanying map 2 Local Green Spaces (Private and Public) then clearly depicts their location.

We are aware of several representations that have expressed concerns regarding the designation of private spaces as Local Green Spaces. Planning practice guidance (Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 37-017-20140306) however states that “Some areas that may be considered for designation as Local Green Space may already have largely unrestricted public access, though even in places like parks there may be some restrictions. However, other land could be considered for designation even if there is no public access (e.g. green areas which are valued because of their wildlife, historic significance and/or beauty).” The clarification within the Plan at the end of page 8 and under table 1 is therefore welcomed.

Policy 2. Local Landscape Features

Dorset Council is supportive of policy 2 which seeks to respect and enhance key local landscape characteristics.

Policy 3. Village character

Dorset Council is supportive of the objective of Policy 3 which is “to ensure that the village retains its links with the countryside and inherent feel as a rural-based community.”

Policy 3 bullet point 1 relates to “limiting infill development to the re-purposing and/or extensions of existing buildings within the defined development boundary, avoiding the loss of large areas of garden / paddock or other undeveloped spaces that make a positive contribution to the local character” Resisting all new build infill development within the Defined Development Boundary would be difficult.

Suggestion: Suggest amending the wording to “limiting infill development, where possible, to the re-purposing and/or extensions of existing buildings within the defined development boundary. New build infill development should be avoided if it would result in the loss of large areas of garden / paddock or other undeveloped spaces that make a positive contribution to the local character.”

		<p>Within <u>paragraph 2.4.2</u>, there is reference to earlier consultations and the desire of local residents to see incremental infilling resulting in the loss of large areas of garden and undeveloped land within the village stopped. If this is a direct quote, it should be identified as such. If this is however an aim of the Neighbourhood Plan, it should be reworded as it is not possible to stop infilling unless there is a clear harm that would result.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: either identify the text as a quote (e.g. through the use of quotation marks and italics) or amend the wording to “should not be encouraged”.</i></p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer has commented that within <u>paragraph 2.5.2</u> there are references to ‘undesigned’ and ‘historic features’.</p> <p><i>Suggestion: Consider replacing these with ‘non designated’ and ‘heritage assets’ respectively to reflect national and local policy language.</i></p> <p>Policy 4. Respecting the history of Puddletown</p> <p>Dorset Council is supportive of the broad aims of Policy 4 which requires development within and forming the setting of the Conservation Area to “respect its key characteristics and features of special interest” summarised in table 2. The Plan also helpfully lists and identifies locally important buildings within table 3. It is noted that the Puddletown Area has a strong connection with the intentionally recognised author Thomas Hardy and the Tolpuddle Martyrs and we welcome support for proposals that raise wider awareness.</p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer has however made several specific suggestions to the supporting text to better reflect national policy wording.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 2.5.5</u></p> <p><i>Suggestion: ‘Whilst these are not designated, these are nevertheless important non-designated heritage assets and a material planning consideration. Their significance and impacts on it need to be demonstrated in proposals to see if any harm is justified...’ You may wish to consider adding a further sentence ‘Other non-designated heritage assets could be identified through further research or through information arising in the planning process.’ Again, this reflects policy and ensures that the identified ‘locally important buildings’ are not the only non-designated heritage assets that might exist.</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><u>Table 3 Locally Important Buildings</u></p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer is satisfied that this list broadly reflects the list in the Conservation Area Appraisal, although No. 16 Mill Street is included in the latter but not in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><i>Suggestion: Adding No 16 Mill Street to Table 3 along with the former terrace of farm workers’ cottages (now Northbrook Farm/Orchard Cottage) and 5-6 Northbrook. Both these buildings have architectural interest and historic interest owing to their associations with the development of Northbrook hamlet around Stafford Park Farm. It would also be prudent to include locally important buildings in the whole Neighbourhood Plan area, which extends considerably beyond Puddletown village, itself only one part of the whole ‘neighbourhood’. In this sense, the policies and descriptions could benefit from a wider gaze to identify what is important and what pressures/opportunities there are in the area as a whole.</i></p> <p><u>Boxed text p.17</u> The Council’s Conservation Officer has suggested re-wording the text in the box.</p> <p><i>Suggestion: ‘...changes that are possible under permitted development rights, subject to any restrictions arising within the Conservation Area or areas subject to current or future Article 4 Directions.’</i></p> <p><i>Policy 5. Design</i></p> <p>Dorset Council is supportive of the aims of Policy 5 to ensure development or alterations to existing development “integrate well with the surrounding area and reinforce local distinctiveness”. We also welcome the cross reference to table 5 which sets out the principals of good design by element and explains what works well and what doesn’t.</p> <p>Table 5, Building Styles and Materials</p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer has suggested that it would be appropriate to insert uPVC as a ‘what to avoid here’. This is consistent with HE guidance and concerns over the sustainability of plastic windows which have a relatively low shelf life. According to Historic England, ‘<i>replacement plastic windows pose one of the greatest threats to heritage value of historic areas</i>’ and they highlight that their incongruous appearance and character makes them ‘unsuitable for older buildings, particularly in Conservation Areas.’ (Traditional Windows: Their Care, Repair and Upgrading (2015), p. 1)</p>
--	--	---

Suggestion: Insert uPVC as a ‘what to avoid here’ in the Building styles and materials section

Other minor typographical corrections

- Paragraph 2.2.1 typo ‘So it is not appropriate for’
- Paragraph 2.2.3 typo ‘for designation’
- Paragraph 2.3.1 ‘south’ is repeated twice here – Puddletown Forest to ‘south-west’?
- Paragraph 2.5.9 and Policy P2 – Martyrs’ plura
- Paragraph 2.6.1 capitalise Neighbourhood Plan

Chapter 3: The Environment

Policy 6. Wildlife and Natural Habitats:

Dorset Council is supportive of the broad objective of Policy 6 which seeks, where practicable, to enhance biodiversity through an understanding of the wildlife interest that may be affected by development including an understanding of the likely impacts of climate change. It is anticipated that these measures “will protect the existing ecological network and secure an overall biodiversity gain”.

Dorset Council is, however, concerned that the requirements for a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMP) duplicates an existing process already set out in the Dorset Council Validation Checklist (adopted 01-Apr-2019). This checklist gives a summary of the BMP from page 17 and this approach should be followed rather than creating additional validation requirements specific to Puddletown unless there is a clear exception to be made which can be robustly evidenced.

Recommendation: Remove the requirement for a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan to be submitted alongside planning applications. Delete the following text:

“A certified Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan will be required where a development would involve:
– *the loss of a native hedgerow (in whole or part), area of unimproved grassland, copse / woodland area or mature tree specimen;*
– *works within 10 metres of a natural watercourse and its margins;*
– *works involving the development of a greenfield site, or a brownfield site in excess of 0.1ha;*
– *works involving a rural barn (including barn conversions) or other roof space where bats may be present.”*

	<p><u>Policy 7. European and internationally protected sites</u></p> <p>The Plan recognises at paragraph 3.2.8 that “Whilst there are no European designated sites within the parish, there are European designated sites in close proximity (including large areas of land to the east and south of the parish) which could be indirectly affected by development. This includes Poole Harbour (which the River Piddle flows into) and the Dorset heathlands between Bere Regis and Bovington, and at Warmwell and Winfrith.” The Plan explains that “Poole Harbour has been deteriorating due to the increased nitrogen levels from sewage and agricultural practices in the surrounding area” and “evidence has shown that residents living within 5km of protected heathland will tend to visit the heathland areas leading to increased damage and wildlife disturbance.”</p> <p>Dorset Council is, therefore, supportive of Policy 7 which seeks to respond to these wider European designations and requires that “Development must avoid having an adverse effect on the integrity of European and internationally important wildlife sites” by cross referencing to the Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD and Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD which set out agreed solutions. Natural England have raised some late concerns with this approach and these are discussed further under Habitats Regulation Assessment.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 3.2.9</u> refers to the requirement for mitigation of impacts on Poole Harbour SAC . For small scale developments mitigation is secured through CIL funds however for larger schemes, mitigation should be provided on site or secured by the developer as part of the development proposal. This sentence should therefore be deleted.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: delete reference to Poole Harbour mitigation being achieved through S106 legal agreements.</i></p> <p><u>Policy 8. Flood Risk</u></p> <p><u>Dorset Council is supportive of Policy 8</u>, however, the text within the policy sets out the requirement for and content of a drainage plan to support developments. This wording would be better moved to the supporting text and amended to clearly set out what should be included within any drainage plan.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: move requirements and specification for a drainage strategy to accompany developments to the supporting text and amend as follows: “3.3.6 Development proposals must therefore be supported by a Drainage Strategy which assesses, and where feasible and appropriate, incorporates opportunities to reduce the causes and current impacts of flooding. It should also set out measures to monitor and ensure the ongoing maintenance and management of the drainage system, and any remedial measures that may be necessary in the event of a systems failure, both on and off-site. Policy 8. Flood Risk: New development or intensification of existing uses should avoid flood risk from all sources and must incorporate a viable and deliverable drainage system to manage surface water</i></p>
--	--

		<p><i>run-off. The future maintenance, upgrade or replacement of flood infrastructure must not be adversely affected by development. The design of any measures included in the drainage plan should take into account the desirability of improving the ecological quality of the River Piddle and Devils Brook.</i></p> <p>Policy 9. Noise Assessments</p> <p>Dorset Council supports the principle of a Noise Assessment policy in the Plan and Map 6 is helpful in showing the approximate areas ‘where road noise may be a concern’. The Council is, however, concerned that the policy as worded does not supply a clear steer in how to determine a planning application, instead focusing on the process requirement for a noise assessments within the mapped area and the standards for mitigation. The current policy text is considered to read better as supporting text and it is instead proposed that the policy is re-worded to specifically state how an application would be determined.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: move all current policy 9 text into supporting text. Insert a new paragraph into Policy 9 that states “Noise sensitive development will not be permitted within the area defined ‘as where noise is a concern’ (map 6) without a noise assessment confirming noise is either below a ‘significant observed adverse effect level’ or can be mitigated through design or layout.”</i></p> <p><i>The supporting text or glossary of terms should define ‘Significant observed adverse effect level’ (SOAEL) as ‘The level of noise exposure above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur.’ Noise Policy Statement for England (March 2010) notes it is not possible to have a single objective noise-based measure that defines SOAEL that is applicable to all sources of noise in all situations. Consequently, the SOAEL is likely to be different for different noise sources, for different receptors and at different times.</i></p> <p>Suggestion:</p> <p>Planning practice guidance, Noise, Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 30-010-20190722 states “For noise sensitive developments, mitigation measures can include avoiding noisy locations in the first place; designing the development to reduce the impact of noise from adjoining activities or the local environment; incorporating noise barriers; and optimising the sound insulation provided by the building envelope.”</p> <p>Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 30-011-20190722 helpfully continues “Noise impacts may be partially offset if residents have access to one or more design measures” listed.</p>
--	--	---

- a relatively quiet facade (containing windows to habitable rooms) as part of their dwelling;
- a relatively quiet external amenity space for their sole use, (e.g. a garden or balcony). Although the existence of a garden or balcony is generally desirable, the intended benefits will be reduced if this area is exposed to noise levels that result in significant adverse effects;
- a relatively quiet, protected, nearby external amenity space for sole use by a limited group of residents as part of the amenity of their dwellings; and/or
- a relatively quiet, protected, external publically accessible amenity space (e.g. a public park or a local green space designated because of its tranquillity) that is nearby (e.g. within a 5 minute walking distance).”

It may be helpful if these examples are summarised in the supporting text.

[Chapter 4: Housing](#)

Policy 10. The scale and location of new housing development in Puddletown

Housing Need

Dorset Council is supportive of Policy 10 and its proposed housing need of about 7 dwellings per annum which equates to 84 dwellings over the Plan period. It is noted that the supporting text discusses housing need in detail including an assessment of past delivery rates, the adopted local plan spatial strategy, an independently commissioned housing needs assessment (May 2018) prepared by AECOM, the National Policy requirement to “significantly boosting the supply of homes” and more recently the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan Review Preferred Options (October 2018) which sets out a further proposed method to calculating housing need but since superseded.

Dorset Council is working on a new Local Plan for the Dorset Council area which is required by National Policy to consider housing requirements for designated Neighbourhood Areas. However, the new Local Plan is at an early stage and, therefore, the proposed approach set out in the supporting text of the NP is considered suitable. It is also noted that the approach proposed reflects the Adopted Local Plan Policy SUS2 strategy that “Development in rural areas will be directed to the settlements with defined development boundaries, and will take place at an appropriate scale to the size of the settlement.”

Housing Supply

		<p>It is noted that in paragraph 4.1.6 that as of September 2019, there were 9 sites which had planning permission for a total of 62 houses (as set out in Table 6) within the Puddletown Area leaving a residual amount of 22 units. The Plan proposes to allocate Land at Athelhampton Road (Policy 12) for 18-22 dwellings and allocate a reserve site at Northbrook Farm (Policy 13) for 10-12 homes. It is also noted that Land at Athelhampton Road has potential for a further phased extension through the review of this plan in 2024 and that windfall development within the defined development boundary can be expected. Dorset Council, therefore, agrees that through these delivery routes sufficient land can be released to meet the calculated housing need.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 4.1.7, Policy 10 and Policy 13:</u></p> <p>The suggestion of a ‘reserve site’ causes concern. It is difficult to enforce a site as a ‘reserve site’ as once it is identified as being suitable for housing development in a plan, a planning application that meets all of the requirements of the site / policy is likely to be approved. The site should either be allocated in this plan as a development site with a suggestion that it should be developed after the other sites (i.e. an indication of phasing), or the site should be removed from this iteration of the plan and allocated in a subsequent version. Given that this site is intended to provide some small scale employment units, it would seem sensible for this site to be allocated in the current plan to enable employment opportunities in the village.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: remove reference to the Northbrook Farm site being a ‘reserve site’.</i></p> <p>As the site at Lanes End has been granted consent but not yet developed (WD/D/17/001429), it should be referenced within the plan as such. A policy should be included to allocate this site for development with supporting text setting out the position / quantum of development that has consent.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Include a policy for the consented residential site at Lanes End</i></p> <p><u>Map 7:</u> should identify the significant sites with consent that haven’t yet been built (primarily Lanes End) as it may expire prior to it being built. Dorset Council is happy to work with the Parish Council to prepare clear maps throughout the document showing the relevant allocations.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: review and update all maps as appropriate.</i></p> <p>Adjustments to the Defined Development Boundary</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.9 explains that “Adjustments have been made to the defined development boundary” to include sites with permission or allocated within the Plan (excluding the reserve site). The defined development boundary (DDB)</p>
--	--	--

		<p>has been removed from protected land such as Local Green Spaces. Similarly Community facilities (such as the schools, the surgery and the pub) which are on the edge of the settlement have similarly been kept outside of the DDB. Finally, much of the area in the vicinity on The Moor and Backwater which is within the flood plain has also been excluded from the defined development boundary, given the need to avoid development in areas at risk of flooding.</p> <p>The supporting text to Policy SUS2 within the adopted West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan discusses the role of future Neighbourhood Plans. Paragraph 3.3.27 explains “Using neighbourhood development plans and other planning tools, communities can allocate sites, introduce or extend a development boundary, or develop a criteria-based policy to allow development to take place, where they consider this is the right approach for them.” Dorset Council is, therefore, supportive of the proposed extensions to the defined development boundary to take into account recent planning permissions or allocated sites. The Council is, however, concerned at the scale of the revisions to the DDB to exclude certain areas including community facilities and areas at risk of flooding although we recognise the specific justifications. The DDB is a well understood planning tool and works in tandem with other policies in the ‘Local Plan’. For example national and local policy and seeks to prevent inappropriate forms of development in areas at risk of flooding and there is no need to re-draw the DDB for national and local policy to remain effective in this regard.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> The proposed DDB should be more closely aligned to the existing DDB in the Local Plan. For example, <i>the DDB should be re-drawn to include areas at risk of flooding.</i></p> <p>Policy 11. House types</p> <p>Dorset Council is supportive of the aim of Policy 11 to locally define the type and size of housing that should be permitted. The overall presentation of the policy is, however, considered confusing for the Plan user as it jumps between tenures, sizes and thresholds with little explanation. Given there are only two allocations this policy seems overly burdensome.</p> <p>Criterion 1, bullet point 1 seeks at least 30% of major housing sites to be affordable 1 or 2 bedroom dwellings. Bullet point 2 seeks at least 1 home or 5% to be affordable home ownership on major sites. In contrast Policy HOUS1 of the Adopted Local Plan seeks 35% in West Dorset split 70% social / affordable rent and a maximum of 30% intermediate affordable housing.</p> <p>Criterion 1, bullet point 3 seeks one, two or three bedroom open market homes. Criterion 2 suggest that “As a result, on sites that can accommodate two or more dwellings, larger homes (with capacity for 4 or more bedrooms) should</p>
--	--	--

		<p>be limited to no more than a single unit (or not exceed 20% of the open market mix on sites of five or more homes)” which appears to conflict with criterion 1, bullet point 3.</p> <p>Dorset Council welcomes criterion 3 which recognises that “The mix of house types may be varied if there is clear evidence that site specific constraints or viability would otherwise prohibit development.”</p> <p>Bullet point 4 seeks homes specifically designed for residents with more limited mobility and/or requiring an element of care. Dorset Council is unsure if this refers to any specific National Standards.</p> <p><u>‘Local People’ and ‘Local Connection’:</u></p> <p>Although it is appropriate to include a local connection test within the neighbourhood plan, the wording as included in the submission draft of the Puddletown Neighbourhood plan is not appropriate. The use of the phrase “born and raised in the community” is likely to cause problems and possibly result in consequences that were not intended. A local connection typically relates to a work connection, a family link or to someone who has lived or worked in the parish for at least the last two years or three of the last five. Currently the test as worded would exclude a wide range of people including key workers.</p> <p><i>Dorset Council has an emerging local connection test as set out in the Council’s Draft Housing Allocations Policy (March 2020). In order to avoid duplication and confusion between processes it is recommended that the Council’s local connection test is instead referenced.</i></p> <p><i>Recommendation: Reference should be made to the Dorset Council’s emerging Local Connection Test.</i></p> <p><i>Site Allocation process</i></p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer has made the following general comments in relation to the site allocations but addresses each site specifically as detailed below:</p> <p><i>“I have some concerns that the baseline heritage information for the proposed sites, as outlined in the SEA (Dec 2018), does not seem to be particularly extensive, though this relates especially pertinent to Site 1. Whilst the policies refer to, for example, respecting setting/character etc., there is no indication that this has been assessed, but the site allocations imply that some development will occur. This might well be the case, but the site should only be allocated on the basis of at least some assessment of significance of the affected heritage assets and the impacts upon them – sufficient at least to understand and justify the principle – rather than leave this to the planning application stage, by which point the site’s very allocation will be taken as some measure of support for development. I note the ‘Heritage</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>Impact’ comments on pp. 55 and 59 of the Consultation Report (May 2020), but these concentrate on specific outcomes and do not necessarily address ‘significance’ of affected elements.</i></p> <p><i>Some of the issues this raises are perhaps illustrated by our observations below, which highlight some tension between the site allocations and the provisions of the NP Policies and, indeed, national/local policies referring to assessing the significance of, and minimising harm to, heritage assets. There is also some possible tension between the site allocations and the aim of Policy 3 which is to support ‘the piecemeal, organic nature of development (and resisting large-scale estate-type developments)’ (p. 14). It is difficult to envisage a development of 18-22 dwellings which would not conform to the latter description.”</i></p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer suggests that wording is added to Policies 12 and 13 as detailed below</p> <p><u>Policy 12 Housing and community uses site allocation: land at Athelhampton Road</u></p> <p>Dorset Council is supportive of the site search process and the Plan’s conclusion for green field release with Land at Athlehampton Road being considered the most sustainable site.</p> <p>It is noted that criteria a) seeks at least 35% affordable housing, however, Policy 11 seeks at least 30% affordable homes (1 and 2 bedrooms) with an additional 5% either starter homes, self-build or shared-ownership. Therefore, it would appear that Policy 12 is not currently compliant with Policy 11.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Criteria a) is amended to say “The type and size of dwellings accords with Policy 11, with at least 30% affordable homes for rent and 5% starter, self-build or shared-ownership affordable homes”</i></p> <p>Policy 12, criterion c). The Council’s Infrastructure Service has commented in relation to the allocated site “Site 1: Access from Athelhampton Road appears achievable – suitable spacing from Milom Lane will need to be provided.”</p> <p>The Conservation Officer has made specific comments in relation to land at Athelhampton Road</p> <p><i>“Policy 12, p. 41: section f) should include ‘Conservation Area’ under the list of elements whose settings need to be respected.</i></p> <p><i>I am aware of the comments made by another Conservation Officer in April/May 2020, as summarised in pp. 52-56 of the Consultation Report, although I retain concerns about the suitability of this site, particularly in relation to a</i></p>
--	---

		<p><i>number of elements identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal [CAA] and the NP itself. I offer the following comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <i>First I draw attention to my comments above regarding Policy 12 and including ‘setting of the Conservation Area’ as a constraint.</i> · <i>The CAA identifies a number of ‘key points of quality’ which contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, including</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>‘good clean edges to the settlement to the north, NE and east’;</i> o <i>‘related to this, well defined entry points, particularly from the west and east, on the former A35’ – this point is highlighted in Table 2 (p. 15) of the NP;</i> · <i>The CAA also states that ‘the village edges are blessed with a number of fine, mature trees, at Ilsington House (seen to particular advantage along Athelhampton Road [emphasis added] and The Green...’ – again, this point is highlighted in the NP (2.3.3., p. 11).</i> · <i>The CAA also identifies the hedgerow fronting the site as an ‘important hedgerow’; that ‘the village has a very definite nucleated plan form’ (p. 14); is ‘reasonably compact’ (p. 15); and the traversal of the CA ‘characterises a representative mixture of spaces, landmarks, views and sensations of relative enclosure and exposure: the elements of townscape’ (p. 15).</i> · <i>As the above points illustrate, any development on the site will directly impact upon key qualities of the Conservation Area and therefore would require some initial substantiation and justification for the principle to be acceptable.”</i> <p>As detailed above the Conservation Officer has suggested that this additional wording be added to the policy suggesting:</p> <p><i>“A comprehensive heritage strategy is agreed with the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with Policy 4, that</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>assesses the significance of all heritage assets potentially affected by the development, including any</i>
--	--	--

		<p><i>contribution made by their setting;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>demonstrates how significance will be taken into account in the design process, i.e. how harm to heritage assets has been avoided or minimised; and</i>- <i>identifies any opportunities to enhance or better reveal the significance of any heritage assets.”</i> <p><i>Recommendation: additional wording is added to Policy 12 in accordance with the Conservation Officer’s comments.</i></p> <p><u>Policy 13. Reserve site allocation: Northbrook Farm</u></p> <p><u>Further to the earlier comments made to Paragraph 4.1.7, Policy 10</u>, Dorset Council recommends the site allocation is included in the Plan rather than when the Plan is reviewed. This has the added advantage of offering choice and competition in the market.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: remove references to this site being a reserve site.</i></p> <p>Dorset Council is supportive of several of the cross references to other relevant policies in the Plan including a bat and barn owl survey (Policies 6 & 7), Noise Assessment (Policy 9) and Drainage Plan (Policy 8).</p> <p><i>We continue to express concern with the Criterion F) as set out in our comments within Policy 12</i></p> <p><i>Recommendation: Criteria f) is amended to say “The type and size of dwellings accords with Policy 11, with at least 30% affordable homes for rent and 5% starter, self-build or shared-ownership affordable homes”</i></p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer has made the following comments in relation to the reserve site:</p> <p><i>“As a contained, developed site slightly removed from the CA boundary and the village core, the site here certainly appears to have some potential and again I note the comments of the Conservation Officer.</i></p> <p><i>However, again the site assessment could have benefited from a more detailed assessment of significance, which could have assisted a judgement as to whether any or all of the buildings are curtilage-listed. The relationship of the farm to the village and the CA would also have been beneficial to assess the suitability of the site, as well as the potential impacts on the setting of Stafford Park Farm and the water meadows identified on the Dorset HER.</i></p> <p><i>Moreover, the NP itself highlights the ‘close connection/intervisibility’ with the water meadows and indeed includes</i></p>
--	--	---

	<p><i>related provisions in Policy 3.</i></p> <p><i>It would be more helpful to highlight these issues as constraints in the policy based on a sound understanding of significance, rather than wait for an application to come forward. In addition, the removal of the stables from the site allocation (owing to its poor condition and ‘so that its early conversion and repair can be progressed’) possibly affects the integrity of the overall vision for the site.”</i></p> <p><i>The Conservation Officer has again suggested that additional wording be added to the policy</i></p> <p><i>‘A comprehensive heritage strategy is agreed with the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with Policy 4, that</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>- assesses the significance of all heritage assets potentially affected by the development, including any contribution made by their setting;</i><i>- demonstrates how significance will be taken into account in the design process, i.e. how harm to heritage assets has been avoided or minimised; and</i><i>- identifies any opportunities to enhance or better reveal the significance of any heritage assets.</i> <p><i>Recommendation: additional wording is added to Policy 13 in accordance with the Conservation Officer’s comments.</i></p> <p>Dorset Council’s Infrastructure Service has also commented in relation to this proposed site:</p> <p><i>“Site 8: Northbrook Farm – Access via the Long Lane onto The Moor may be achievable. A new access direct onto The Moor may not be achievable given the nature of the highway in this vicinity. Footway improvement/linkage to Puddletown would be required.”</i></p> <p><u>Chapter 5: Community facilities and other infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>Policy 14. Supporting Community Facilities and Local Services</u></p> <p>Dorset Council is supportive of Policy 14 and its aim for “development proposals to improve the provision of community facilities (including those listed below) in a manner in keeping with the character of the area”. Eleven sites are listed in the policy and depicted on the policy map allowing for easy identification.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 5.1.1</u> makes reference to the “lower” school whereas elsewhere the school is described as the “first</p>
--	---

		<p>school”. The correct term is “first school”.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: amend the text to refer to the first and middle schools.</i></p> <p><u>Table 7 Community infrastructure –identified needs</u></p> <p><i>Suggestion: for clarity of presentation, it seems as though the text in Table 7 should not be in a box.</i></p> <p><u>Chapter 6: Business, employment and tourism</u></p> <p>Dorset Council notes that no specific policies or site allocations for new employment workspace or additional visitor facilities have been included in this plan.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 6.1.6</u> does not fully reflect the Local Plan policy on large scale tourist accommodation.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: add text: “but with a focus for large scale tourist accommodation to be within town centres” at the end of the first sentence</i></p> <p><u>Chapter 7: Transport and traffic</u></p> <p><u>Policy 15. Creating safer roads and pedestrian / cycle routes</u></p> <p>Dorset Council is supportive of the policy aim to create safer roads and pedestrian / cycle routes and welcomes the cross reference to Table 8 Traffic Management Proposals and policy map identifying the pedestrian route connections.</p> <p>The last paragraph of this policy looks to manage construction traffic associated with large sale developments. A planning condition is normally attached to large developments to manage construction traffic. The proposed approach is therefore not necessary.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Delete the last sentence of Policy 15.</i></p> <p><u>Map 8 Quiet lanes and connections and large vehicle routes</u></p> <p>It is very difficult to see the difference between the existing and proposed quiet lanes connection as they are in similar colours.</p> <p><i>Suggestion: One of the colours be changed so they can be more easily differentiated.</i></p>
--	--	---

Table 8 it should be noted that many traffic matters fall outside the scope of planning; for example changes to traffic management on existing transport networks are usually for the Highways Authority to deal with. Changes to traffic lights, speed limits, signage, and traffic circulation, crossing points and other traffic management devices usually fall outside the scope of Neighbourhood Plans. These restrictions do not however apply to the spending of CIL which can be used to deliver some of the suggestions in Table 8.

Suggestion: Table 8 should be renamed Traffic Management Suggestions.

Policy 16. Parking Provision

Dorset Council understands the sentiment behind Policy 16 which seeks to maximise car parking provision in a rural location with few other practical transport opportunities. However, the Council would stress that the County Parking Standards remain the agreed standards for determining planning applications. Local Plan Policy COM9 Parking Standards in New Development explains “parking provision should be assessed under the methodology set out in the Bournemouth, Poole & Dorset Residential Study (or its replacement)” taking into account factors such as the level of accessibility. We are not aware of any local evidence that would compel an applicant to exceed these agreed standards.

Recommendation: The first paragraph is amended to read “Parking provision should meet county parking standards.”

Appendices

It is noted that there are a large number of appendices associated with the Neighbourhood Plan. It may be more appropriate that some of these (Appendix 5 & 6) are supporting documents rather than as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Habitats Regulation Assessment - Appropriate Assessment

Natural England were consulted on the Appropriate Assessment for the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan in February 2020. In their response in April 2020, Natural England explained that they would respond to the consultation on the Appropriate Assessment for the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan in more detail once they had reviewed the ‘strategic nitrogen budget’. Natural England were concerned about the lack of evidence regarding the delivery of mitigation against the impacts of elevated concentrations of nitrates in the Poole Harbour European Site from new

		<p>development within the Poole Harbour hydrological catchment.¹</p> <p>Since this time, Natural England have reviewed a draft of the monitoring report for the Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD. Whilst the monitoring report shows that sufficient mitigation has been provided for the period 2017-19, Natural England have raised concerns about the backlog of mitigation from permitted but not yet completed schemes and have suggested that future development may be required meet the nitrogen offsetting requirements prior to occupation. Natural England have recommended, in their response to the Neighbourhood Plan consultation, that the wording of Policy 7 is amended to ensure that development cannot commence until sufficient nitrogen offsetting measures has been delivered.</p> <p>They have suggested this wording to be added to policy 7:</p> <p><i>“Development will be required to confirm the nitrogen budget and set out specific and appropriately located mitigation measures that would be implemented in order to ensure that development is nutrient neutral from the start of its operational phase. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development's effects. A financial contribution to strategic mitigation measures may be an appropriate alternative to direct provision of mitigation. In this case it will be necessary to liaise with Dorset Council and Natural England to confirm an appropriate mitigation scheme to which the contributions will be directed and to ensure any contributions are sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the Poole Harbour internationally designated sites”.</i></p> <p><i>Recommendation: Dorset Council suggests that these changes are made to Policy 7 so that impacts are avoided.</i></p> <p><u>Additional comments</u></p> <p>Natural England have also suggested that the neighbourhood plan may attempt to deliver the necessary level of mitigation for the allocated development within the plan through the provision of permanent land use change within the Neighbourhood Plan area. This might be achieved by the NP allocating additional agricultural land for land uses with a low nutrient status that will also be of benefit to the local community and/or biodiversity interests (eg community woodland, community orchards, nature reserve, new wetlands, or other similar green infrastructure</p>
--	--	---

¹ Further information on the issue of nitrates in Poole Harbour is presented in the adopted Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

		<p>including SANG).</p> <p>Achieving nitrogen mitigation on a neighbourhood plan scale is considered an aspiration rather than a requirement, as the Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD requires nitrogen neutrality to be achieved on a catchment scale where there are considered to be greater opportunities for the delivery of nitrogen mitigation.</p> <p><u>Covid-19</u></p> <p>The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 require <i>“neighbourhood planning groups and local planning authorities to undertake publicity in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area. The regulations also stipulate that it is important “all groups in the community have been sufficiently engaged, such as with those without internet access, more targeted methods may be needed including by telephone or in writing.”</i></p> <p>There are also requirements in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 that require <i>“neighbourhood planning groups and local planning authorities to publicise the neighbourhood planning proposal and publish details of where and when documents can be inspected. It is not mandatory for copies of documents to be made available at a physical location. They may be held available online.”</i></p> <p>In response to the pandemic, the regulation 16 consultation was carried out in unusual circumstances. In order to follow government guidance, and Dorset Council’s own health and safety advice, no hard copies of the plan were made available in the Council’s offices or local libraries. Consequently, there was a greater emphasis on the consultation being held online. However, Dorset Council did notify neighbours, adjacent to the proposed housing allocation sites, about the consultation by letter. The Parish Council also undertook a greater amount of local advertisement (including posting details of the consultation on the community facebook page and putting up posters and notices). Therefore, Dorset Council is satisfied that in these unusual circumstances publicity was carried out in a “manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area”.</p>
27	Michael George	<p>I am writing to provide feedback to the Draft PNP. I tried to send this feedback before your deadline but there was an error 503 on your server.</p> <p>I want to register the strongest possible objection to the inclusion of Catmead land as LGS4 in the PNP. The area</p>

		<p>fronting numbers 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 is private land owned by the residents of Catmead and managed for us by the Catmead Management Company. It is a private communal garden, and is maintained by the residents in superb condition. I strongly believe that the residents should have control over the management of their private land.</p> <p>Earlier this year the authors of the PNP invited feedback to the draft plan. I did provide feedback and in it I formally requested that this land be removed from any LGS4 designation. I received no reply, leading me to believe that the request for feedback was merely a “box ticking” exercise and that the creators of the plan have their own agenda with no intention whatsoever of listening to feedback from residents.</p> <p>I am confident that this feedback will reach people who will listen and have a sense of responsibility.</p> <p>Again, I want to register the strongest possible objection to the proposal which would remove control from the residents of Catmead over their own private land. My advisers tell me that a legal response is available if that control is removed.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would send a confirmation that you have received this email.</p>
28	Mirella Placidi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would like to strongly object to the development of Policy 12: Chapel Ground site and its inclusion as one of the proposed sites for development within the Puddletown Neighbourhood Plan - I know the site well and have lived at The Schoolhouse 3 Athelhampton Road for more than 25 years. - Chapel Ground is outside the existing development boundary and does not abut the existing development boundary, it is part of the countryside surrounding the village - Chapel Ground provides a buffer between Little Knoll Copse, (an area of Deciduous Woodland Biodiversity Action Plan Habitat, as well as an ancient woodland) and urban development. Disturbances to Chapel Ground would upset the abundance of wildlife in and around the field. There are countless mammals, birds and amphibians that habitat the woods opposite my house as well as Little Knoll Copse. During the year bats, hares, field mice, toads, slow worms, owls, buzzards and many more indigenous wildlife species can be seen – swallows use Chapel Ground as a feeding ground and nest in my garages. Hares use the field when it is laid to pasture. Unfortunately earlier this year, two men coursing in Chapel Ground were seen carrying a dead hare away, but hares have been part of this landscape for many years. - As well as supporting our indigenous wildlife, Chapel Ground is also prime land for food protection, arable as

		<p>well as livestock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Puddletown Neighbourhood plan identifies the need for affordable housing in Puddletown – but it does not provide a sustainable choice of sites to accommodate these housing needs - Chapel Ground is situated opposite the Grade II Ilington Manor and abuts SSI sites, my property The Schoolhouse, The Chapel and The Manse , given the heritage issues of this particular site any development in Chapel Ground would need to be bespoke in order to be in keeping with the style of this particular part of Puddletown, as was necessary when granting planning permission for Puddletown Surgery - developments of these types are expensive and are unlikely to provide genuinely affordable housing for Puddletown first time buyers - Chapel Ground also as indicated in the Neighbourhood Plan is sloping uphill from Athelhampton Road there is approximately a drop of 4ft/5ft from the field to the ground level of my property The Schoolhouse , any type of development to the rear would dominate these properties . - Both sites proposed and if developed would be at a loss to grade 3 agricultural land , in context of this and in reviewing the neighbourhood plan I feel an update and amendment to the neighbourhood plan should be made in order to consider the development of sites that will not impact our countryside <p>By proposing the two sites the draft neighbourhood plan does also restrict development within the development boundary and further infill development should be proposed in the plan as suggested in the consultation statement.</p>
29	Hannah Nickless Wessex Water	Thank you for your consultation. Our previous comments are still relevant with nothing further to add