

BROADWINDSOR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

November 2018

Contents

Why we have produced this document:	1
Statement of intent and action:	1
The Consultation Timeline and Key Stages:	1
Stage 1 = Scoping (February 2016).....	5
Stage 2 = Household and Business Questionnaires (September / October 2016)	7
Stage 3 = Call for Sites	32
Stage 4 = Roadshows (November 2017)	33
Stage 5 = Pre-Submission Draft Plan Consultation (June – September 2018)	44

WHY WE HAVE PRODUCED THIS DOCUMENT:

This Consultation Statement has been prepared by the Broadwindsor Plan Steering Group for two reasons:

A) to conform to the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should:

- a) Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan
- b) Explain how they were consulted
- c) Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted
- d) Describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

B) To record our actions so as to inform the community, as well as the regulatory authorities, of how the Draft Plan was drawn up.

This Consultation Statement provides an overview of each of the stages of consultation in accordance with Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations.

This Consultation Statement summarises the statutory and non-statutory consultation undertaken with relevant statutory bodies and stakeholders, other than those that could be described as being a part of our community, in developing the Broadwindsor Neighbourhood Development Plan.

STATEMENT OF INTENT AND ACTION:

- Work on producing a plan started in May 15th 2015 when the steering committee was formed, through to November 2018, when the results of the feedback on the Draft Plan were presented to the Parish council;
- We raised awareness by frequent advertising in local media and house to house distribution of questionnaires and information, and by updates to Parish Council meetings;
- We held events (see timeline) and consulted statutory bodies and individuals in the community throughout the consultation (see timeline and appendices nos.) in order to inform the decisions made by the Steering Committee, so that those decisions reflected the issues and aspirations of both local residents, businesses and the statutory bodies.
- Throughout the period of consultation, meetings of the steering group were regularly held, usually monthly. The minutes of the meetings are available on the Parish Council website <http://broadwindsorgroup.gov.uk/community/neighbourhood-plan/>

THE CONSULTATION TIMELINE AND KEY STAGES:

Consultation informing the Neighbourhood Plan lasted from February 2016 to September 2018. The following summarises the main events and consultations held during this period, and how this influenced the Plan

May 2015	Formation of a steering committee
September 2015	Consultation with Jo Witherden (Dorset Planning Consultant), an independent planning consultant formerly with West Dorset District Council. Jo Witherden retained as consultant.

Nov. 7 th , 2015	Introductory Coffee Morning at Drimpton; well attended.
February 2016	<p>Stage 1: Scoping</p> <p>Public meetings at Drimpton and Broadwindsor, led by Jo Witherden. These were advertised through the Parish magazine and posters.</p> <p>Scoping sessions were held with the local community at two key events in early 2016, led by Jo Witherden. These advertised through the Parish magazine and posters. These were held on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 9th February at Comrades Hall, Broadwindsor – 23rd February at Drimpton Village Hall <p>Additional events were also run with the Neighbourhood Plan steering group and at Drimpton Coffee morning. The aim of these sessions was to raise awareness of the neighbourhood plan process and to start to collate everybody's views and opinions on what to consider for the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Approx 40-50 people attended the Broadwindsor event, and 35-40 came to the Drimpton event.</p> <p>The results of the scoping helped inform the main issues identified for the Neighbourhood Plan were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Possible need for housing – Importance of village amenities – Importance of rural character and situation in AONB
April – November 2016	<p>Stage 2: Household and Business Surveys</p> <p>A Questionnaire was formulated and composed from feedback comments at the public meetings, including from post-it note boards.</p> <p>Questionnaire hand-distributed to all households, advertised on local web-sites, in local press (<i>Bridport News</i> and <i>View From</i>), local magazines (<i>Broadwindsor News</i>) and on posters around the parish. Distributed starting September 26th, to be completed and collected or returned to Community Shop by October 24th 2016. 700 distributed; 60% response. A separate Business questionnaire was delivered to appropriate businesses and advertised. 52 responses to the Business Survey.</p>
December 2016	<p>Questionnaires responses analysed (using eSurv.org, which provides a tool for conducting online surveys. It is free for all, without limitations, restrictions or upgrade plans) and the full results and a summary were made available for public access (and remain so) via the Broadwindsor Group Parish Council website (http://broadwindsorgroup.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016Dec12-results-for-publication-Illustrated.pdf and http://broadwindsorgroup.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016Dec08-Questionnaire-Summary.pdf). The results of the questionnaire provided the evidence on issues that were important to local residents and businesses, and the type of development that they would support.</p>
March – April 2017	<p>Stage 3: 'Call for sites'</p> <p>Call for sites issued to local landowners, via local newspapers (<i>Bridport News</i> and <i>View From</i>), Broadwindsor Group Parish Council website and on posters around the Parish.</p> <p>15 sites were submitted for consideration as a result. The sites and their assessments fed into the next consultation.</p>

May 2017	Annual Parish Meeting (held at Broadwindsor). Chairman of PCC gave update on Neighbourhood Plan progress. A brief Neighbourhood Plan information update sheet was placed in Community Shop
June 2017	Sites offered by landlords inspected by NP steering committee group, with Jo Witherden. Feedback on the sites from statutory bodies organized and received by Jo Witherden and fed into the site assessment summaries. As a result four sites were not considered likely to be acceptable due to their greater environmental impacts and distance from established settlements, and the landowners were invited to withdraw these (which they did).
November 2017	<p>Stage 4: Roadshows</p> <p>Full Day Road Shows, fully illustrated with maps, potential site details (etc etc..RH DC) held at Broadwindsor, Drimpton, Blackdown. Publicised in local press (Bridport News and View From), on local websites and by laminated posters as well as a flyer to every house. A record of attendees at the roadshows was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Blackdown event on 04-11-2017 = 21 attendees – The Drimpton event on 11-11-2017 = 84 attendees – The Broadwindsor event on 19-11-2017 = 43 attendees
December 2017	<p>Analysis of roadshow questionnaires; 170 questionnaires, having been returned. The consultation helped identify those sites that local residents considered likely to be suitable and acceptable for development, based on a clear idea of site-specific issues and possible mitigation measures, and was also used to gather further evidence on the support for local green spaces, the importance of the gaps between settlements, and to check progress on other issues identified for inclusion in the draft plan. As a result of this stage of consultation, four of the sites (Land E of Netherhay Lane (N end), Netherhay, Land west of Netherhay Lane, Drimpton, Land at Beck's Field, Netherhay, and Land South of Mill House, Kittwhistle) were not included in the draft plan – the Strategic Environment Assessment noting that these alternative sites did not appear to be preferable to the selected site options when considered against the sustainability objectives, and were generally less supported by local residents in their consultation responses.</p>
February – May 2018	Draft Plan, with approval and input by NP steering group, drawn up by Jo Witherden and very fully discussed at several meetings of steering group. Meeting with District Council Neighbourhood Plan Link Officer in Dorchester February 26th 2018.
May 14 th 2018	Draft plan presented to Parish Council and unanimously approved to put forward.
June – Sept 2018	<p>Stage 5: Pre-Submission Draft Plan Consultation</p> <p>Open Consultation, advertised in local press, on the parish website, in the parish magazines and by individual flyers. Emails were sent to the statutory consultees. Two Road Shows held, at Drimpton and Broadwindsor.</p> <p>A record of attendees at the roadshows was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Broadwindsor event on 16-06-2018 = 29 attendees – The Drimpton event on 23-06-2018 = 40 attendees <p>The consultation period was extended from the usual 6 week duration, due to the SEA report not being published for consultation in the first 6 weeks.</p> <p>Of the forms given out, the number received back was 34, plus two letters. Responses</p>

were also received from statutory consultees - see page 44.

The key findings from this stage were that the plan was, broadly, accepted. The main changes to the Neighbourhood Plan policies made as a result of the pre-submission consultation feedback can be summarised as follows:

- New Policy BGNP4a - on Local Wildlife Corridors and Protected Species added in response to the request by Dorset County Council (Natural Environment Team).
- Policy BGNP5 on Important Gaps – minor wording changes to more closely align with NPPF tests on major development in the AONB
- Policy BGNP8 on meeting the area’s housing needs –reference to removing permitted development rights to extend new homes deleted, due to the limited impact of complexity of such a policy approach.
- Policy BGNP11 on Land at Manor Farm, Common Water Lane, Broadwindsor – inclusion of reference to need for a detailed heritage impact assessment
- Policy BGNP16 on Land at Brent Paddock, Netherhay – inclusion of reference to not exceeding the height of Brent Paddock

More details on the key stages is provided in the sections that follow.

Stage 1 = Scoping (February 2016)

Example of publicity used:

Broadwindsor Neighbourhood Plan Committee **Public Meetings**

The Neighbourhood plan committee invites all residents of the Broadwindsor Group Parish to attend two meetings:

First meeting on 9th February at Comrades Hall,
Broadwindsor, and the
second on 23rd February at Drimpton Village Hall,
both meetings start at 7.30pm.

Planning policies are very important in deciding what will or will not get planning permission. The new Local Plan for West Dorset has set strategic policies for this area. The policies differentiate between towns, larger villages, smaller villages with 200+ population and all other areas (countryside).

Neighbourhood plans...

Our plan needs to be in general conformity with national and local strategic policies. The plan can change things, such as amending / adding to settlement boundaries, allocating sites for development; it may include design guidelines and designate green spaces and more.....

A Neighbourhood Plan is not a tool to stop development that would otherwise be allowed, but it does put us, members of the community, in the 'driving seat' to decide where and how to meet local needs and what issues and places to focus on; it must be realistic and deliverable.

The meetings are to collate everybody's views and opinions on what to consider for the Neighbourhood Plan.

Items we want to cover at the meetings include:

Local needs:

- Housing / Business / Social / Transport / Other Infrastructure.

The assets we need to protect:

- Landscape / Heritage / Character / Wildlife / Community Facilities.

Places that could be changed for the better and provide development opportunities.

Please put your thinking caps on so that we can make good use of these meetings to enable our plan to evolve to serve our community and future generations well.

The Neighbourhood Plan Committee needs your input to ensure that this happens.

For more information please contact either:

- | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------|
| • Rowland Hibbard | rowlandhibbard@yahoo.co.uk | 01460 30269 |
| • Steve Chubb | chubbies1@btinternet.com | 01308 868385 |

If you are unable to attend a meeting your ideas are still welcome, please send them to either of the contacts above.

Having reviewed the feedback on possible needs, key assets to protect and opportunities for change, the main issues emerging were collated on post-it notes at the event:



This identified:

Possible need for housing

Particularly the delivery of affordable housing for local people, housing for young people leaving home, families with young children, and retirement homes/flats or sheltered accommodation. There was some debate as to whether there would be any merit in also providing more employment to keep working age people locally employed, but no overall picture that there would be strong demand for this.

Importance of village amenities

Protect existing community facilities - Possible improvements particular regarding public open spaces (for play / allotments) as extension to the village hall, updated playground.

Importance of rural character

There were many rural features that were flagged up as important to protect, the distinct nature and character of the settlements, the public rights of ways and views across the area, particularly valued green spaces, hedgerows and streams

Given the predominantly older demographic of participants at the scoping session, the **possible need for employment** has also been flagged by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group for further investigation.

Stage 2 = Household and Business Questionnaires (September / October 2016)

During October 2016 each household within the Broadwindsor Group Parish was given a questionnaire, with everyone in the parish invited to take part and ensure that a wide range of views, not just those of the Committee or Parish Council, is taken into account.

690 questionnaires were distributed, of which 407 completed questionnaires were returned, almost a 60% response rate. (Questionnaires returned blank were not counted as part of the response rate). 52 Business questionnaires were also completed.

Instructions given on how to use this questionnaire:

** Everyone in the Parish, who wishes to do so, may fill in a questionnaire. If not enough were delivered, please just ask, you will have contact details with this questionnaire.*

** If you decide to fill it in jointly, as a household, please tick the box, on page 9, which says so and then only fill out one questionnaire.*

** If you have a business, of whatever size, please also see the back page.*

** If you need help filling out the questionnaire, please ask (see contact details that came with it). Most of the questions ask how strongly you feel about something, or how important something is to you, please show how you feel about something by circling a number. * For example, circling 1 shows it's not important to you, or that you really disagree, whereas circling 6 shows it's very important to you, or that you really agree a lot. * You may circle anything from 1 to 6. Please circle just one number.*

** If you make a mistake, just put an X through it and circle the one you meant.*

** If you don't have a view on an item listed in a question you don't have to circle a score.*

** You will also find spaces for you to add any of your own thoughts or comments.*

The results are presented in graph form, together with commentary, which was not intended to be exhaustive, but merely an assistance in looking at the results.


People were invited to make comments, questions or observations about the results.

Section A

Things which are important to you

1. What makes the Parish a place to live?


1. How important to you are any of these things in making this Parish a place to live?



There were five topics which gained more of the highest ratings than others: Facilities for sport, leisure and recreation; good school facilities; good social life and community spirit; local services and shops with most highly rated of all being the landscape and scenery.

There were over 70 written suggestions, with most comments being about pavement/footpath and road

conditions, public transport and accessibility.




Section B


Landscape and Environment.

Traffic, Transport and Accessibility

2. How much agreement was there with statements about Traffic, Transport and Accessibility?




Responses to Question 2 indicated some dissatisfaction with both parking and safety for cyclists and walkers, with more respondents disagreeing with the statements than agreeing. By far the greatest number of written suggestions were about speed and weight of vehicles.



3. Walking and Cycling

How much do people walk or cycle to access local facilities or to visit friends, family or other social activities?

3. Walking and Cycling




Walking or cycling locally, at least a few times a week, is enjoyed by over half of respondents.

4. Driving and car use

Approximately how many car journeys are made each week?

Hardly anyone makes no car journeys, or has no car available. The greatest proportion indicated between 7 and 14 journeys a week. There were 7 with no car available.

4. Driving and car use




5. Public Transport or Taxi

Approximately how many times a week is public transport or a taxi used?


Public transport and taxis showed little use, with over three quarters showing none at all.

5. Public Transport or Taxi




6. People were asked to what extent they would support three things, in areas affected by possible development.

How much would you support any of the following, in areas affected by possible development?



Very definite support for increasing the number of passing places, whereas increased street lighting was not supported. There were 106 other comments, predominantly about speed, volume and weight/size of vehicles, lighting, traffic management and pavements/footpaths.

Q6 Other suggestions




Employment and Economy

7. If you were interviewed about employment and business, for this Neighbourhood Plan, please tick this box:

10 people ticked this box, over 50 business questionnaires were completed.

8. To what extent was it thought that any of the following would help jobs and the local economy?


8. Would any of the following would help jobs and the local economy?



Three of the four suggestions were supported: Protecting existing employment sites, the conversion of existing buildings to employment use and finally encouraging home working. However allocating more land for new employment development was not supported as a means of helping jobs and the local economy. The view seems to be that there are sufficient employment sites to meet the needs of the parish.


9. How much would you any of the following be welcomed?

9. How much would you welcome any of the following?



Question 9 asked about energy and communication. There was not good support for commercial renewable energy schemes, however there was support for such schemes if community owned. Woodland for fuel was supported, though strongest support was for improved mobile phone and data.

10. Respondents suggested locations within the Broadwindsor Group Parish thought suitable for new employment development?



Question 10 asked for suggested locations for new employment development (see Question 8, where opinion was divided on allocating land for employment development). There were 6 suggestions, plus 9 respondents saying No


development and 1 saying micro-brewery. The two main locations suggested were Axe Road/Mill and the Craft Centre.

11. If the Neighbourhood Plan were to try and encourage employment, how much would people like to see any of the following being encouraged?


In answer to Question 11, the types of employment to be encouraged were agriculture and horticulture related. To a lesser extent, Equestrian, Tourism and Leisure, Crafts and Arts, Offices and small business, Pubs, Restaurants and cafés, and Shops were supported (though with opinion rather divided on offices/small business).

Definitely not supported were light industrial and manufacturing, nor storage and distribution which attracted 147 of the marks in lowest grading.

11. Encouraging employment




There were a few written comments, as can be seen below, none had more than 3 people raising the topic.



12. Do you have any other comments on jobs, employment and the local economy?


Very few respondents added further job and employment related comments, 7 did take the opportunity to say there should be none.



Housing

13. To what extent was it thought that the Neighbourhood Development Plan should indicate sites for building for the following possible purposes?

13. NDP indicate site purposes




See next page for summary of results and other comments submitted by respondents.

Sites for houses for sale on the open market and sites for private rental were not supported. However, adaptable, shared ownership and housing association homes all attracted support.

The written suggestions regarding sites in the development plan mainly concerned the provision of affordable housing for local, young people, with 17 making that point, the next most commented item was to improve infrastructure.

Q13 Suggestions




The next question asked what type of house building or conversion people might support.


14. Type of house building (and conversion) supported

14. What type of house building (and conversion) would people support?

1 or 2 bedroom homes for first time buyers was the most strongly supported option (270 for, 88 against). Also supported, but less strongly were Last purchase homes and Family houses/bungalows. There was not support for larger houses, or flats. 180 were against (142 in favour) Apartments within converted houses, whilst 196 supported the Conversion of agricultural buildings, versus 128 against.




Q14 Types suggestions



There were some additional comments made, most suggesting that development should be related to community needs, the use of brownfield sites, starter homes, eco-friendly and self build.

15. How much would different sizes of development, which might be built within the Broadwindsor Group Parish boundary, be supported?


15. Sizes of development supported



There was clear opposition to a few larger development sites (243 against versus 66 for), whereas 197 were in favour of more sites with fewer houses, and 128 against.

There were 34 additional comments, almost a third of which concerned small developments and the use of eco-friendly methods.


Q15 Development size comments



16. What were the views on housing growth in the foreseeable future?

The questionnaire included information about the average number of builds per year over the last 15 years, a figure of 5.

16. Housing growth




Most respondents disagreed that there should be less growth than happened previously (164 v 67), the strongest support was to continue the average rate of development (201 v 109) and finally, there were 181 in favour of more development being allowed, if it is needed, versus 139 against.

Section C

Opinions and suggestions from public meetings held earlier this year in Broadwindsor and Drimpton


17. How much do any of these assets and characteristics make our Parish a special place?

17. Characteristics making Parish a special place?




Question 17 (graph above) asks a similar question to Question 1, but specifically asked respondents about characteristics of the parish which had been highlighted as special at two public meetings. Several of the items had over 300 responses in agreement: Including School, Post Office, Pubs, Village Shop, the distinctive character of villages and buildings, Farmland, Open spaces and above all being an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; this is reflected in the comments, below, with the unspoilt peaceful nature of the parish leading, also valued were the community and neighbourliness.

Q17 Characteristics comments



18. Recommended or preferred locations for development.

Q18 Location suggestions




18 Respondents offered suggested locations, for development, only 3 mentioned by more than 1 person: Axe Lane/Mill, Netherhay Lane and the Craft Centre.

19. Affordable Local Housing

How much did respondents support the idea of affordable local homes through a CLT?

19. How much do you support the idea of affordable local homes through a CLT?




This question related to the specific provision of affordable housing through a Community Land Trust, as a working group (now formally established) was setting up a CLT at the same time as our Neighbourhood Plan research.


The first chart shows all responses to the question about support for a CLT across the Broadwindsor Group Parish, with over 77% of respondents in favour, and over 41% giving the highest grade of support.

The second, displays the results for the whole parish again, but this time with the results from respondents in Drimpton and Netherhay shown alongside. This is because a proposed site for a CLT development had been indicated at Netherhay Lane. Over two thirds (68%) of Drimpton/Netherhay respondents were in favour, with 36% scoring at the highest rating in favour. Support for the idea of affordable local homes through a CLT, comparing Drimpton/Netherhay with the Parish as a whole.

Q19 Affordable homes through CLT. Parish and Drimpton
Left axis: Percent



20. Comments suggesting other needs were invited.




There were 49 text responses to this question, with a range of suggestions, hardly any mentioned by more than a couple of people. The one to stand out was for some form of facility for social care and health care.

Section D

About you


21. Non-work travel

How far do people usually travel to shop, access services (e.g. doctor), entertainment and similar?



22. Getting to work .

How far do people travel to work (including unpaid work):




Most of the work travel was to places outside the parish, though 44 respondents said that they work at home.

23. Type of work

Which best describes your work status?


Each of the various forms of work are considerably less than the just under 49% who are retired. Nearly 22% are in full time work, 11% in part time work and over 12% are self-employed. Less than 1% are unemployed.



24. The number of people in each household by age group.

The age profile matches the pattern of employment, with a higher proportion being of retirement age.


24. Age groups



25. |The number of people in a household with special care needs.

There were 20 households having 1 person with special care needs, 2 with 2 people and 1 with 3 people.


25. Household number of people with special care needs




26. Type of houses

The three main types are detached houses, bungalows and semi-detached.

26. House type




27. The number of bedrooms




The greatest proportion is of 3 bedroomed homes.

28. Answers to home ownership type show overwhelmingly owned (with or without a mortgage) and Housing Association a distant second.




29 and 30. Likelihood of moving house in the next 5 years.

There are many more who will not be moving or are unlikely to do so, whilst there were 75 who are very likely to move outside or within the parish.




31. How did people see their housing needs?

Most reported no need, the next highest number (42) was for smaller property to downsize.




32. How long have people lived within the Broadwindsor Group Parish area?

Just under 60% of respondents have lived within the parish for 11 or more years, at the other end of the scale, 7% have lived here less than a year, and 6% for between 1 and 2 years.




33. If people moved into the Parish from outside, how far did they come?

107 respondents moved from further afield in the South of England, the next largest number was 82 from within West Dorset and then 58 from elsewhere in Dorset, South Somerset or East Devon.



34. In which part of the Broadwindsor Group Parish do respondents live?


A good spread of places across the parish with most, coming from Broadwindsor and Drimpton.



35. How many attended school within the Broadwindsor Group Parish?

35. Attended school within the Broadwindsor Group Parish


53 who answered the question had done so and 329 not.




36. Was there anything else at all which people wished to comment on, or suggest, which may help with the Neighbourhood Plan?

There were 62 final additional comments, 14 of them about speeding and road safety more generally, then 8 each about safer footpaths, public transport links and affordable housing for locals.

Finally there was the opportunity for children and young people to give their input.




20 questionnaires carried comments in this section. More than half dealt with the provision of play and recreation facilities, including making them appropriate to different age groups, so that, for example, younger children didn't feel intimidated playing in areas used by older children.



38. Who completed this questionnaire? (Please tick 1 box)

Most (259) were household questionnaires, 37 the views of 1 person in a household where others were doing their own and 68 were from 1 person households.



Broadwindsor Group Parish Business Responses

The following is a summary of the data obtained from the business questionnaire:

Although farming occupies the largest part of this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty the biggest employers are in Construction and Light Engineering.

71% of businesses in the Parish work from home, and 50% of employees overall live within the Parish. Only 17% of businesses said that they were likely to employ more staff in the next 5 years and only 5% said they would be likely to look for new, improved or expanded premises during that time scale.

Half of the businesses in the Parish buy goods or services from other local organisations, whilst a quarter of them do business on a Nationwide basis.

Provision of child care was a low priority (5.7%) as was a requirement for parking. Although many made mention of wanting better roads for transport vehicles.

65%-70% agreed that the provision of faster broadband and a much better mobile signal was essential to their survival.

These results are taken from the questionnaire sent out, from 52 businesses in the Parish, who replied.

Stage 3 = Call for Sites

Publicity example



Clip art courtesy of Clipartogram

CALL FOR SITES

Broadwindsor Group Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Do you own some land in the parish?

- * Perhaps a garden that is now too large, or
- * A green field site, or
- * Buildings which could be converted or redeveloped.

Would you like the Neighbourhood Plan to include it to allow some sort of development to take place?

If you do - you should please tell us now.

Suggesting a site does not guarantee that it will be included in the Neighbourhood Plan, or that it would definitely be developed, but it does mean that you would like it to be considered.

This 'Call for Sites' will close on April 30th 2017, so please submit your response before that deadline.

Forms are available from the Chairman,
Rowland Hibbard, Kittwhistle Garage
rhibbard@broadwindsorgroup.gov.uk
or the Clerk to the Parish Council:
hello@broadwindsorgroup.gov.uk or see
broadwindsorgroup.gov.uk/community/neighbourhood-plan




Clip art from Panda Free Clipart Images

Stage 4 = Roadshows (November 2017)

During the course November 2017, road shows were held to give people the opportunity to look at the work so far undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee, including the Call For Sites results, Vision and Objectives, Green Spaces and more, with displays in Blackdown Village Hall on 4th November, Drimpton Village Hall on 11th November and Comrades Hall, Broadwindsor on 19th November. At each venue, feedback forms were freely available and it was also possible to print them from online. Tables and pens were provided to complete forms at the road show, or take them home for completion. This resulted in 177 returns of feedback forms. (cf. Household questionnaire: 407).

The first question sought views on the sites which had been submitted as a result of the call for sites. It was evident that this was a key area of interest in the displays.


Question 1 results are presented (below) in the form of 2 charts. In the first, the sites are displayed according to levels of suitability and unsuitability, in the second each site is listed with a display of its acceptability rating. In both cases the ratings of Highly Suitable and Suitable/Acceptable have been added together to indicate views on suitability and, similarly, Highly Unsuitable and Unsuitable have been added together to indicate views on unsuitability.



The two sites with the highest suitability rating are firstly Axe Mill with 97, followed by 7a (the potential CLT location) with 78. The next nearest were Manor Farm, Broadwindsor (69) and Brent Paddock, Netherhay (68). The lowest neutral score was the potential CLT site (11).

The site with the most unacceptable scores was the Netherhay Lane field at the Netherhay end (98), followed by the land west of Netherhay Lane (82) and then the potential CLT location (69).

The result regarding Axe lane is potentially misleading as the site assessment had marked it for employment only but, from some comments, it appears possible that some of its grading was regarding suitability for housing as well as employment.



The same results are presented in a different way with this second chart (above) for question 1, which makes it more clear for each site how acceptability and unacceptability compare. They compare as follows, whichever is the greater is underscored, except 1: Fullers and 12: Manor Farm, Drimpton, where the numbers are in italics, as the difference is less than 5.

1: Fullers, Broadwindsor	Acceptable: 59	Unacceptable 56
3: Manor Farm, Broadwindsor	Acceptable: <u>71</u>	Unacceptable 30
6: Hillside, Broadwindsor	Acceptable: <u>70</u>	Unacceptable 34
5: Brent Paddock, Netherhay	Acceptable: <u>65</u>	Unacceptable 46
7a: Netherhay Lane, CLT	Acceptable: <u>80</u>	Unacceptable 69
7b: Netherhay Lane, Netherhay end	Acceptable: 31	Unacceptable <u>98</u>
11: West Netherhay Lane	Acceptable: 26	Unacceptable <u>82</u>
12: Manor Farm, Drimpton	Acceptable: 58	Unacceptable 54
14: Axe Mill, Netherhay	Acceptable: <u>97</u>	Unacceptable 16
15: Beck's Field, Netherhay	Acceptable: 35	Unacceptable <u>61</u>
8: Barn, Ash	Acceptable: <u>52</u>	Unacceptable 29
9: Mill House, Kittwhistle	Acceptable: <u>37</u>	Unacceptable 27

There were 28 people who did not grade any site acceptable (5 or 4), or in other words who did not give any site any grade in favour of development (that excludes blanks).


Question 2 asked about the distribution of any new development, it was asked in 2 ways and the results are presented in those 2 ways.

There is agreement in both forms that smallest settlements with no facilities are not suitable for development.

There was also agreement that all settlements could benefit from some growth, though in the second form of the question the difference is marginal.

Question 2

Distribution of potential new development, agreement




More clear cut was agreement that distribution should mirror the current population spread.

There isn't a clear answer to the final option of most homes being at Broadwindsor as one form of the question agrees and the other does not.

Question 3 indicates that all of the listed green spaces and walking routes are more important than not,


Question 3

Green spaces and walking routes




although there are some variations, largely in the number which were left blank.


Similarly, **Question 4** (chart below) indicates that most respondents regarded gaps between all settlements as important, the highest rating being the gap between Drimpton and Greenham.




Question 5 showed a good level of agreement with the work done to list important local characteristics.



Question 6 showed more agreement than not with the passing places suggestions, though not as clearly as in the previous question about local characteristics.



Finally, **Question 7** sought views on the Vision and Objectives suggested by the committee. All were rated Okay.



Comments on the forms.


In addition to ticking boxes or grading answers, people were invited to add comments and suggestions. The results are shown in the following charts, please note that in most cases people did not add comments, for

example in the most commented question (about potential sites) 91 forms had no comments added in that section. The full text comments, as provided by each respondent, have been given to each committee member.

Question 1 is dealt with in a variety of ways to try and extract, in a fair and accessible way, the range of comments and how they were presented.

The first chart shows all the points made (after coding and grouping) across all sites, for example across all sites the aggregate count of comments mentioning “inadequate infrastructure and/or amenities” was 39.

Whilst this helps to see the range of concerns and comments, it does not tease out issues relating to individual sites, or groups of sites (where people have made the similar comments on their form about a pair or range of sites). That information is shown broken down in the subsequent 3 charts.




By far the greatest concern across all sites was inadequacy of infrastructure and/or amenities, at 39, followed by flooding and/or drainage concerns, then comments around keeping development proportional to settlements. As noted above, Axe Mill attracted comments to the effect that it is suitable for mixed use, including housing.

Here is the key for Question 1:


- A Inadequate infrastructure and/or amenities
- B Retain agricultural, horticultural land
- C Connecting footpath needed

D	Development conditional on improved public transport
E	No need for new housing
F	Keep level of development proportional
G	Retain quiet village and gaps
H	Limited employment opportunities
I	Avoid light pollution
J	Sensitivity to existing residents
K	Spread, not group houses
L	Opposed to all development
M	Include housing at Axe Mill
N	Keep Netherhay lane rural, build alternative access
O	Build for locals and/or Affordable housing
P	Retain current flora
Q	Keep rural character, attend to visual impact
R	Retirement housing
S	Reduced amenity access
T	Flooding and/or drainage concerns
U	All sites could be built on
V	Allow for parking needs
W	Low power lines in the way
X	What is CLT?


As you will see on the next chart, sites 7 and 14 attracted the most comment about “Inadequate infrastructure and/or amenities.” It is difficult to read the charts in any detail, though the main features stand out.




Some people made comments which they attached to more than one site and these are shown below, again you will see a focus on “inadequate infrastructure and/or amenities.”



Some forms were returned with comments where no site name or number was given, these are shown below. “Inadequate infrastructure and/or amenities” features again, followed by “Flooding and/or drainage concerns” and then “Keep level of development proportional.”




Q3. Important green spaces and walking routes



Netherhay lane and some approach paths to Lewesdon Hill were indicated as omissions from the committees green space and walking route suggestions.

There was a range of issues raised under landscape characteristics, none more than 5 times.


Q5. Important local landscape characteristics



There were 2 main topics raised under transport and travel (the committee had included road pinch


points): “No development, therefore no more traffic” and “Review and Integrate public transport services.”

Q6. Transport and travel



The Vision and Objective comment field was used in 12 cases to make a point against development on the basis of “Inadequate infrastructure/amenities/employment”.

Q7. Vision and objectives. What have we missed or got wrong?



Stage 5 = Pre-Submission Draft Plan Consultation (June – September 2018)

The pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan was made available online via the Broadwindsor Group Parish Council website and at roadshows held in June 2018 in

Comrades Hall, Broadwindsor and Drimpton Village Hall. Feedback forms were made available online and printed versions were given to everyone attending the roadshows, feedback was also invited by email or letter and all verbal comments by attendees at the roadshows were noted.

Of the forms given out, the number received back was 34, plus two letters.

The distribution of the 34 was: 7 from Broadwindsor, 9 from Netherhay and 18 from Drimpton, also the source of the 2 letters.

Compared to the Household Survey (690 questionnaires distributed, of which 407 completed questionnaires were returned, almost a 60% response rate) the response rate is very low, thereby diminishing the significance that be attached to percentage responses for or against.

The following statutory and other consultees were contacted for their input at this stage:

Local Councils	Responded	Adjoining Parish Councils	Responded
Dorset County Council	Yes	Thorncombe PC	N
Somerset County Council	N	Marshwood PC	N
West Dorset District Council	Yes	Mosterton PC	N
South Somerset District Council	N	Crewkerne TC	N
Other Statutory Consultees	Responded	Beaminster TC	N
Environment Agency	N	Misterton PC	N
Highways England	N	West Crewkerne PC	N
Historic England	Yes	Wayford PC	N
Natural England	N	Winsham PC	N
Wessex Water	Yes		
South West Water	Yes		
SGN	N		
Dorset AONB Partnership	Yes		

The following summarizes the key points raised and suggested actions.

All comments and letters from local residents were circulated in full to and considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee. Salient extracts from comments and letters are reproduced here.

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Main points raised	Consideration and Suggested actions
<i>General</i>	Dorset County Council	We remain concerned that the plan appears silent on general flood risk in the area and omitting local concerns regarding flood risk is a missed opportunity and may undermine future planning applications where it is necessary seek, drainage betterment on the grounds of flood risk. DCC is aware of historic flood events that have occurred in this area which has led to internal and external flooding – although the cause and details of these flood events are not always known. Please do not assume an area locally known to flood will be appropriately represented on national scale strategic maps. By highlighting local flooding problems and developing policies for land use, a community can manage and reduce the risk of flooding.	Flood risk has been considered in the SEA and site selection process. However given the availability of flood risk information it was not considered to be a critical issue for inclusion in the plan. Suggested Action: Additional information to be included in the plan on drainage issues
<i>General</i>	Dorset County Council	Although pleased to see that each housing allocation policy makes reference to the Dorset Biodiversity Protocol, the Plan must include a biodiversity policy, stating what ecological interest and biodiversity is contained within the Plan area and what measures will be taken to protect these features. The Plan does not make reference to wildlife sites (such as SSSIs, SNCIs) within the relevant area, nor is there any reference to protected species and habitats contained within the Plan area which must be considered as part of any development management.	The Neighbourhood Plan is not required to include this information given that there are overarching policies in the Local Plan that would cover this matter, and the plan has been subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment. However its inclusion would provide useful information relevant to the area and planning decisions. Suggested Action: Include biodiversity policy and supporting information as suggested referencing the information on the local and potential ecological network and the Dorset Biodiversity Protocol.
<i>General</i>	South West Water	The level of housing growth anticipated will not present any difficulty in our being able to support drainage requirements.	Noted Suggested Action: No action required
<i>General, BGNP1</i>	Dorset AONB Partnership	Overall, the plan has fulfilled its duty of regard to the purpose of the AONB, which has been achieved both through consultation regarding housing site options and also by the inclusion of Objective 1, as well as helpful references to the	Support noted Suggested Action: No action required

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Main points raised	Consideration and Suggested actions
		AONB's Management Plan the Special Qualities of the area.	
<i>Section 2, BGNP5</i>	West Dorset District Council	The important gaps need to be clearly identified. The policies maps later on in the document show some open gap areas in more detail however not all the areas marked in red on the Assessment of Settlements and Gaps plan are shown in this way. The gaps of greater length should not be included. The second part of the policy talks about major development in the countryside. As the plan area is within the AONB under national policy any major development would have to be justified in terms of 'exceptional circumstances' and 'public interest' therefore 'the requirement to be 'carefully considered' in the moderate gap areas does not seem to accord	Map 2 is intended primarily for information in terms of the gaps that were assessed. This can be made clearer in the supporting text. The policy is not intended to undermine the requirement for major development in the AONB to be justified in terms of 'exceptional circumstances' and 'public interest' and this can be made clear (although the gap between Greenham and Childhay is not within the AONB) Suggested Action: Amend supporting text to clarify that the map is indicative, and refer to the NPPF requirements regarding major development. Amend policy to clarify the need for development to retain the rural setting and clear distinction between these settlements.
<i>Section 2, BGNP5</i>	Wessex Water	There are often constraints on the location of infrastructure development (for example because of existing below ground infrastructure and levels) which would necessitate a countryside location and there should be greater recognition that this may be allowed within the defined gaps.	Noted – the policy and supporting text should be adjusted to take on board exceptions where there is an over-riding need for the development that cannot reasonably be located outside of the gap. Suggested Action: Amend supporting text and policy to clarify that exceptions may be made where the development is for necessary infrastructure that cannot be located outside of the gap. In such circumstances, the scheme should be located and designed, including appropriate landscaping, to minimise any adverse impacts on the open nature and functioning of the gap.
<i>Section 2, BGNP5 BGNP12.</i>	West Dorset District Council	There appears to be a conflict with Housing site 06 (and potentially others) as it seems to be within an area shown as an open gap on the Assessment of Settlements and Gaps plan.	See above. The gap as defined on the Policies Map does not overlap with the site allocation. Suggested Action: No further actions required.
<i>Section 2,</i>	Historic England,	We welcome the inclusion of information on the distinctive	Support noted

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Main points raised	Consideration and Suggested actions
<i>BGNP6 and Table 3</i>	West Dorset District Council	historic character of the settlement (p15)	Suggested Action: No further actions required
<i>Section 4, BGNP8 (& Foreword, para 1.15)</i>	West Dorset District Council	We would advise that housing targets should be specified as “at least”. As such the target for the number of new homes in paragraph 4 should be amended to “at least 4 new homes per year” rather than “between 4 and 5 new homes per year”.	It is noted that the Local Plan Review preferred options draft is proposing an indicative minimum target based on a level of housing growth which would increase the population of the neighbourhood planning area by a minimum of 5% over a 20-year period. This would equate to 2 dwellings per annum for the Neighbourhood Plan area. As such the NP target is already in excess of this minimum and the higher level of growth proposed does not therefore need to be expressed as a minimum. Suggested Action: No further actions required
<i>Section 4, BGNP8 (& Foreword)</i>	West Dorset District Council	Depending on what was intended, it may be better to use the phrase “homes for first time buyers” rather than the more rigidly defined “starter homes”	This may provide more flexibility but having review the legislative definition this appears to be equally appropriate to meet local resident expectations but may benefit from clearer definition. It is also noted that the threshold is 6 (not 5). Suggested Action: Amend threshold to 6 and refer to legislative requirements in regard to starter homes (where first referenced in the plan).
<i>Section 4, BGNP8</i>	West Dorset District Council	It should be noted that the government has sought to relax permitted development rules to allow homeowners to extend their homes more easily and within the General Permitted Development Order 2015 there are more restrictions for dwellings within the AONB and protected areas. As such you may wish to consider whether the blanket removal of all permitted development rights is necessary	It is accepted that the removal of PD rights as suggested is unlikely to have a material impact on the housing supply, and therefore its inclusion within the policy is largely unnecessary, and the plan would be simpler without this matter being raised Suggested Action: Delete reference to PD rights in this context
<i>Section 4, BGNP8</i>	West Dorset District Council	In relation to the approval of larger homes the policy specifies the need for additional justification and the ability for the dwelling to be subdivided. Whilst additional justification may be	This can be clarified by reference to practicality Suggested Action:

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Main points raised	Consideration and Suggested actions
		feasible the ability for the dwelling to be subdivided may not be a practical requirement. As such you may wish to reconsider this point.	Add "if practical"
<i>Section 4, BGNP10 and Table 5</i>	Dorset AONB Partnership, West Dorset District Council	The approved Fullers scheme is considered likely to be implemented (which is 12 more units than the number envisaged within the draft plan). This would therefore have an impact on <i>Table 5. Potential sites for inclusion – outcomes</i> and this should be amended. It would also be appropriate to update the Policy in line with the consented development.	The decision has not as yet been issued some 8 months after the committee decision to approve pending the signing of a legal agreement (website checked prior to submission on 17/11/18). Until such time as the decision is issued, the policy should remain as drafted. It is clear from the consultations undertaken that the full site as proposed to be approved is not supported by local residents, and that to amend the plan to allocate the full site could result in a lack of support at referendum stage. Suggested Action: No further actions required.
<i>Section 4, BGNP10</i>	Wessex Water	There is an existing underground water main which crosses the site. Statutory easements must be observed or the main diverted. We note that this has been identified	Noted. Suggested Action: No further actions required
<i>Section 4, BGNP10</i>	Local residents	Concern that the impact on the privacy and amenity of resident's living opposite (and potential fire risk due to thatch) has not been considered	The existing buildings already front onto a public highways, and the potential of overlooking can be further avoided through detailed design considerations at planning application stage. There is no evidence to suggest that development in this location would lead to increased fire risk. Suggested Action: No further actions required
<i>Section 4, BGNP11</i>	West Dorset District Council	The Conservation Officer has assessed this site and agrees with the site assessment. There is a grade II listed building in close proximity to the site and its setting may be affected if the existing buildings on site are replaced or increased in height. As such the Conservation Officer considers there to be a negative impact on heritage.	Noted – this is reflected in the SEA. However it may be useful to clarify that a heritage impact assessment should be submitted as part of any planning application Suggested Action: Amend policy to make reference to potential heritage impact

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Main points raised	Consideration and Suggested actions
			and requirement for more detailed assessment to identify appropriate mitigation
<i>Section 4, BGNP11</i>	Wessex Water	Section 4.38 identifies that water mains reinforcement may be required to provide satisfactory service levels. For a development of 5 dwellings the site would receive the minimum standards of service for pressure and water mains reinforcement would not be required. However, the developer will need to specify internal pumping to reflect the pressure available.	Noted – the text can be updated to reflect the latest information. Suggested Action: Amend supporting text to reflect the advice provided by Wessex Water.
<i>Section 4, BGNP12</i>	West Dorset District Council	The Conservation Officer agrees with the site assessment. “A Neutral effect on heritage has been allocated to this site in the scoring. This is correct.”	Noted Suggested Action: No further actions required.
<i>Section 4, BGNP12</i>	Local residents	Concerned regarding road safety	The Highways Authority has been consulted, and the policy criteria include the need for a suitable visibility splay and improved pedestrian access from the site into the village is secured, if practical and achievable. Suggested Action: No further actions required.
<i>Section 4, BGNP13</i>	West Dorset District Council	The policy specifies ‘small scale exception sites’ but it does not specify what is meant by small scale. It is also unclear how “otherwise closely related to the defined development boundary” should be interpreted and we would suggest that this is more clearly defined.	Similarly ‘small scale’ is not defined in the NPPF or Local Plan, and it is not considered appropriate to define a finite number as this will depend on the nature of the site and location. However examples of what ‘otherwise closely related to the defined development boundary’ would / would not include may be useful. Suggested Action: Include clearer guidance on where development would or would not be considered to be closely related to the defined development boundary
<i>Section 4,</i>	West Dorset	Whilst the site has been reduced and now does not extend	The Conservation Officer comments are confused in that there

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Main points raised	Consideration and Suggested actions
BGNP14	District Council, Historic England	across the entire width of the field we are still concerned that development in this area would be closing an important gap between the settlement of Drimpton and Netherhay. Much will depend on the design of the scheme and how much of the land is developed. The Conservation Officer has also commented that <i>“Development within this site would likely affect the setting of both listed buildings within Netherhay. It would also infill the historic gap between Drimpton and Netherhay and therefore removes any physical and visual gap between these settlements. If the entire site were development it would also significantly increase the settlement size and therefore impact upon the landscape character of the AONB in this area. A negative effect on Heritage has been allocated to this site in the scoring. This should really be a significant negative effect.”</i>	would be a physical and visual gap left of at least 120m as demarcated by the open gap designation. The is greater than the existing gap with residential development at Marksmead. At 0.8ha it will not significantly increase the settlement size which extends to around 14ha (less than a 6% increase). The issue of design and in particular the landscaping treatment of the northern edge is detailed in the policy. Suggested Action: No further actions required.
Section 4, BGNP14	Local residents	Various concerns regarding the general location / suitability of Drimpton for affordable housing, impact on rural character and gap, traffic and pollution	The site has been assessed through the Strategic Environmental Assessment process, which identifies that none of the rejected site performed better than the allocations included in the plan. The SEA has helped identify appropriate mitigation, including (in respect to this site) the need to retain a clear gap to the north, the layout to avoid the root protection areas of the mature trees and retention of the existing hedgerow boundary as far as practical etc. Suggested Action: No further actions required.
Section 4, BGNP15	West Dorset District Council	The Conservation Officer considers that there is unlikely to be any significant heritage impacts from development at this site and agrees with the Site Assessment.	Noted Suggested Action: No further actions required.
Section 4, BGNP15	Local residents	Concern from neighbouring landowner in regard to the occurrence of surface water flooding that has happened at times of heavy rainfall	There are no records of this event, but this can be mentioned in the supporting text and if confirmed dealt with through an appropriate drainage strategy at the time of the planning application.

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Main points raised	Consideration and Suggested actions
			<p>Suggested Action:</p> <p>Amend supporting text to note the need to consider off-site flooding.</p>
Section 4, BGNP16	West Dorset District Council	There is concern that development on this site is likely to impact the immediate setting of the Grade II listed Methodist Chapel. A neutral effect on heritage has been allocated to this site during in the site assessment. The Conservation Officer disagrees with this assessment and has commented that <i>“This should be negative due to the impact on the setting of the chapel”</i>	<p>There is an intervening development (2 storey house) between the chapel and the site, which lies of the rear of the chapel, which was subject to planning in 2015 (ref WD/D/14/002779). In considering that planning application, the LPA concluded that “The application site is located adjacent to the Methodist Chapel which is a grade II Listed building. The Methodist Chapel is a traditional brick and stone building. Nevertheless due to the position of the Methodist Chapel on a corner plot and with its main aspect to the south the proposed dwelling and the Chapel will not been seen in the same context within the street scene therefore the proposal is acceptable.” It is therefore inconsistent to now conclude that a site further away (and not visually connected) to the chapel would have an adverse impact.</p> <p>Suggested Action:</p> <p>No further actions required.</p>
Section 4, BGNP16	Local residents	Suggest height restricted to single storey	<p>There is no clear reason to restrict the height in this location subject to remaining in keeping with the adjoining properties (ie no higher than Brent Paddock) so as not to be prominent in respect to the nearby Listed Chapel.</p> <p>Suggested Action:</p> <p>Amend supporting text and policy to make reference to not exceeding the height of Brent Paddock.</p>
Section 4, BGNP16	Local residents	Suggest potential to include some housing on this site	<p>The site has been put forward for housing by the landowner, and is not as well related to a settlement as other preferred housing site options. Furthermore, the introduction of housing could limit the mix of business uses on the site.</p>

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Main points raised	Consideration and Suggested actions
			Suggested Action: No further actions required.
<i>Section 4, BGNP17</i>	West Dorset District Council	Some concerns have been raised by the Conservation Officer in relation to this site. Whilst the policy does seek to retain the hedgerow it does specify 'and retain the hedgerow as far as practical' as such there is concern that this hedgerow could be lost during development. If development is located to the south of the existing hedgerow on Axe Lane or if this hedgerow is removed, this is likely to impact the rural setting of the Grade II listed Methodist chapel. A neutral effect on heritage has been allocated to the site in the site assessment however if development is located south of the existing hedgerow on Axe Lane or if this hedgerow is removed, this site is likely to impact the rural setting of the Grade II listed Methodist Chapel.	See above notes re the LPA consideration of the 2 storey house immediately adjoining the rear of the chapel where the LPA concluded in effect that there was no harm to the chapel's setting. It is therefore inconsistent to now conclude that a site further away (some 240m) and where the retention of the southern hedgerow should be secured as there is no likely reason for its removal) would have an adverse impact. Suggested Action: No further actions required.
<i>Strategic Environmental Assessment</i>	Dorset County Council	It is not possible to tell if DERC have been contacted to request Phase 1 survey of the proposed sites.	As explained in Table 5 DERC undertook the relevant surveys (and has now also surveyed Site 10 which had been omitted), and the main findings are summarised in relation to the site appraisals (para 10.20 onwards). The ecology report will form part of the submission documents. Suggested Action: Add ecology findings from Site 10 into the plan.
<i>Strategic Environmental Assessment</i>	Historic England	The SEA provides additional evidence on the methodology used in the site assessment process employed and confirms the involvement of relevant heritage officers at West Dorset District Council and the nature of their comments on the sites in question. This is referred to in the table on p20 and against individual site assessment reports. In that we are essentially happy to defer to this expertise it provides reassurance as to the impacts on heritage assets which proposed site allocations are likely to generate. Most of the proposed sites	Noted. Suggested Action: No further actions required

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Main points raised	Consideration and Suggested actions
		appear to receive a clean bill of health from a heritage perspective and there is as a consequence only one outstanding point of clarification we would identify as being desirable to address (see comments on BGN14).	
<i>Strategic Environmental Assessment</i>	West Dorset District Council	The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the options for the Broadwindsor Neighbourhood Plan appears to be incomplete as it does not provide details of why each of the rejected options has been rejected. The Local Plans spatial strategy focuses the majority of new development in larger settlements where there are more opportunities for jobs and services. As such the preference for sites in the Drimpton area does not accord with the Local Plan spatial strategy and additional justification needs to be provided.	Noted Suggested Action: Update SEA to include this information
<i>Strategic Environmental Assessment</i>	West Dorset District Council	The SEA Directive requires an account of “the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme” to help determine the baseline conditions against which the impacts can be determined. The report doesn’t appear to include this.	Noted Suggested Action: Update SEA to include this information
<i>Strategic Environmental Assessment</i>	West Dorset District Council	The SEA Directive also requires “a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information” which also is not included in the report.	Noted Suggested Action: Update SEA to include this information

Other points raised

Page / Policy	Respondent/s	Other points raised	Actions taken (if applicable)
<i>Front Cover</i>	West Dorset District Council	We would suggest for clarity that the plan period should be printed on the front cover	Agreed
<i>Foreward</i>	West Dorset District Council	It would be more accurate to refer to the Localism Act as the key legislation (rather than the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017)	Agreed
<i>Foreward</i>	West Dorset District Council	Suggest replace “which were brought forward for approval by landowners” with “were suggested by landowners”	Agreed
<i>Foreward</i>	West Dorset District Council	Suggest replace “Before it is finalised it will be put to a local referendum, to make sure it has local support” with “Once it is finalised it will be put to a local referendum and then used when determining planning applications within the Neighbourhood Plan area”	Agreed – similar wording used
<i>Section 4, para 4.29</i>	West Dorset District Council	In paragraph 4.29 there is mention of 70% of growth within or close to Broadwindsor. We are not sure where this reference has come from; it may be useful if this could be clarified.	Agreed
<i>Maps</i>	West Dorset District Council	Several of the maps in the plan are difficult to interpret due to their lack of legend or key or their use of symbols. The council is happy to work with the Neighbourhood Forum to produce higher quality maps to ensure that the detail on each can clearly be understood.	This support would be welcomed

Question asking about support for the plan as currently drafted

	Responses	Total
I support the plan as drafted	15	52%
I generally support the plan but suggest some minor changes	8	28%
I do not support the plan and it needs fundamental changes	6	21%

Selection of salient comments on individual policies within the plan

Respondent ID	Comments on BGNP 02
14197883	Good policy
Respondent ID	Comments on BGNP 03
14197866	Beneficial to all
14197883	Green space needs protecting
Respondent ID	Comments on BGNP 04
14197883	Good local facility
Respondent ID	Comments on BGNP 06
14243047	We strongly support this policy of maintaining gaps between the various settlements.
Respondent ID	Comments on BGNP 10
14201400	Except that the policy should take into account that the properties on Redlands Lane facing the site are thatched and as such there is a fire risk from bonfires and fireworks if the back gardens of the new properties are too close to the road.
14243037	With reservations - it is along a road with mains facilities which is good, has a school and a shop, however no employment and regular transport.
Respondent ID	Comments on BGNP 14
14243037	The sewerage system does not allow for chemical separation, e.g. bleach, washing detergents. The school is full and there is no playgroup. Shops are accessible by car which means that each property would have to have two cars. This is not cost effective for families in affordable housing. Potentially, there could be 30 cars on the new site. The impact on traffic and pollution would be detrimental. Drimpton is occupied by mainly retired residents but that does not matter. They move here for peace and quiet.
14243047	We support this policy with the stipulation that it must be made clear that if the currently proposed CLT housing scheme does not proceed for any reason then the site designated under this policy should fall away as a possible site for development.
14243082	Not the correct site for the CLT development
14243100	The CLT Development should have been on BGNP10, Fullers Site
14243277	Unsuitable/too large. Wrong location.
14243389	With reservations, particularly no more building in that field.

14243419	With reservations ie No more building on that field
Respondent ID	Comments on BGNP 15
14201382	My house is adjacent to this site and I am raising a matter which is of major importance to me. This related to the management and control of surface water which will occur on this site. The land slopes in two directions (length-ways and width-ways) and both slopes direct surface water in the direction of my house. We had a bad experience when the field was re-seeded and rolled. This was followed by heavy rain, and water poured off the land in huge volume, surrounded our house, and came up to just below the damp course.
Respondent ID	Comments on BGNP 16
14243389	Up to 2 bungalows along lane side only, not houses and no more building in field.
14243419	Up to 2 bungalows along Axe Road only, not houses. No more building in field.
Respondent ID	Comments on BGNP 17
14242947	Axe Mill site is a far better alternative, with better access and a majority of public support. Although this site is designated for light industry there is no reason that limited housing should not be included. Such usage would limit the damage to the communities of Drimpton a Netherhay with many people seeing the value of their properties reduced by as much as 10% The site location at Netherhay Lane needs to be urgently re-visited and altered..
14243277	Axe Mill site is a more suitable area.
14243389	Likely increase in traffic, noise and pollution. Crewkerne Road suffers from too many HGVs now for a country lane.
ID	Other comments
14243419	I suggest, yet again Axe Mill Industrial Estate for a limited number of houses. That area is close to existing housing on both sides and would cause limited disturbance or nuisance.
14243195	I cannot support the plan if Site 7A, Netherhay lane is included. Please see my proposals attached. (Entered in Final View Box. BBH)
14243100	BGNP14 must only be allowed for affordable housing. Is the term "Exception" strong enough?
14243082	Drimpton/Netherhay does not offer any infrastructure for the CLT Development
14201387	We also support BGNP 9 and 10 and 18
14201352	Table 5 "Potential sites for inclusion Site No Ref 06 Land to the north of Hillside, Drimpton Road, Broadwindsor. The 20 mph speed limit begins at the existing site entrance/exit and is frequently not observed. We have seen, on a daily basis, cars (coming from both directions) travelling at up to 50 mph. The existing "calming measures" (speed bumps) have no effect at all. - Currently there is no pavement provision for pedestrians and it is difficult to see how one could be provided without agreement from neighbouring property owners to the removal of a

	significant strip of land from their plots, all of which are built on an upward slope from this narrow road.
14197883	We need to take control of our own destiny
14197856	App the plans. We need houses and CLT building
Respondent ID	Supporting comments
14243047	I generally support the plan but suggest some minor changes *
14243537	<p>As a general observation this was a well written and all-embracing document on proposals for future housing in the Broadwindsor Group of Parishes. I do however have a number of comments as follows:- (a) The percentage of new buildings In order to mirror current population most residents agreed to a 40% Broadwindsor and a 25% Drimpton split in the number of additional houses to meet current demands. This appears to have been amended to 43% Broadwindsor and an increase to 58% for Drimpton. In my view the Neighbourhood Plan should revert to the original figures of 40% and 25%. (b) Number of Dwellings It was my understanding that residents would support a maximum of 5 dwellings per development. This has been exceeded On Site 1 and certainly on Site 7a (CLT), which may be outside the Neighbourhood Plan proposals as it is an independent proposal with different cost and demand criteria, this has been exceeded. In my view the number of dwellings falls within the Neighbourhood Plan remit, these should be limited to 5 dwellings per development. (c) Axe Mill Site No 14 Whilst acknowledging that this site is a little isolated nevertheless it has potential for development incorporating both housing and light industry. Whether the latter is economically viable is questionable looking at its recent history. Its current facilities however are significant and advantage should be taken of them. In my view this site requires an in-depth feasibility study to determine its potential for light industry and housing. (d) Netherhay Lane Site 7a I was surprised that reference was made to this site as it is a totally independent proposal with its own particular criteria. It has always been my view that it should be clearly demonstrable that there is a majority in the community of Drimpton that support this proposal. One survey showed that out of 177 forms 80 respondents found the site acceptable with 69 against. There was no analysis, that I recall, which ensured that these figures were purely from the residents living in Drimpton. My other concern about this site is how the area separating Drimpton from Netherhay was formulated? I propose that before the CLT's proposal are finalised, that site 7a is shown to be what the community of Drimpton considers to be the most appropriate for social housing.</p>