

## Buckland Newton Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Plan Representation Summary

Buckland Newton Parish Council submitted their final version of the Buckland Newton Neighbourhood Plan (November 2015) to West Dorset District Council for independent examination in January 2016. People were given six weeks from Thursday 28 January 2016 until the end of Thursday 10 March 2016, to comment on the content of the plan or how it was produced. At the close of the public consultation 21 representations were received.

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
1	Ashley Kingsbury	<u>Site B: Field to Rear of 1-6 Majors Common on the B3143</u> Surface water flooding along Castle Lane
2	Charles & Wendy Weston	<u>Site A: field south of 'Higher still', west of B3143</u> Highways safety, drainage, fauna (ducks, barn owls, bats & frogs), limited public transport, inadequate car parking, lack of employment opportunities and limited public facilities. <u>Site H: Field to the east of Landscombe Vale</u> Drainage and fauna (deer, barn owls, bats, long tailed tits, badgers & frogs)
3	Chris Mason	Misinformation at public meetings, flawed questionnaire design, qualitative data has been ignored, inadequate community response rates, failure to advertise meetings and publish minutes and agendas, conflicts of interest within the steering group
4	Christopher Burnett	Identification of surplus sites, question the need for sites I, J, K, L in AONB. Conflict of interest within steering group. The needs of aging population have not been adequately addressed. <u>Site A: field south of 'Higher still', west of B3143</u> Support. Close proximity to services. <u>Site B: Field to rear of 1-6 majors common on B3143</u> Acceptable. Infill development <u>Site H: Field to the east of Landscombe Vale</u> Against. Open landscape <u>Sites C/D: Land north of Lydden Meadow and Brooklands, on either side of the B3143</u> Site C is acceptable. Site D acceptable but at a lower density. <u>Site E: Field north of Brookfield, west of Parish Field</u>

Buckland Newton Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – March 2016

		<p>Against. Proximity to school, traffic, landscape impact, green corridor, development adjacent site.  <u>Site F: Land opposite Duntish Farm, east of B3143</u>  Against as presented, acceptable if relocated on site of redundant farm sheds.  <u>Site G: Old Farm Buildings, Brockampton Dairy Farm</u>  Acceptable  <u>Site I: Land at Knap Farm, off Lockett's Lane</u>  Against. Traffic and flooding.  <u>Site J: Land adjacent to Lydden Cottage, Lockett's Lane</u>  Against. Traffic and infilling in the AONB.  <u>Site K: Land south of the Old Mill, Duntish</u>  Against. Infilling in AONB and ribbon development.  <u>Site L: Land to north east of Knapps Hill Cottages, Spring Grove</u>  Against.</p>
5	Richard brown Dorset AONB	Supportive of the Plan proposal for small scale and incremental growth in Buckland Newton. Minor amendments suggested.
6	Michael Holm Environment Agency	We can confirm that the plan accords with National Planning Policy and the local plan by applying the Sequential Approach to development locations. We support that the document has consider the local flood risk within the plan area; including that which is outside of our flood map for planning (surface water). We support the principles to enhance the river corridors through the appropriate landscape buffers. These should look to enhance the diversity to provide improved environments for the protect species identified in the plan area.
7	Gaynor Gallacher Highways England	Satisfied that the proposed policies are unlikely to impact on the strategic road network (specifically the A303 and A35). Welcome the focus on enabling limited growth to reflect local needs and support sustainable community facilities, which should help reduce the need for out-commuting.
8	David Stuart Historic England	Lack of information within the Plan to evidence how an assessment of heritage assets has informed the selection of sites allocated. Note that the West Dorset District Council conservation team have been involved in the process of housing site identification.
9	J & G Nell	<p><u>Site A: field south of 'Higher still', west of B3143</u>  Highway safety (speeding traffic, lack of footpath, proposed shop car park), fauna (deer, foxes, barn owl), disruption of footpath</p>

Buckland Newton Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – March 2016

10	Janet Burnett	<p>Over development of the village, conflict if interest within the steering group, lack of minutes. Any housing should be affordable or small scale starter homes.</p> <p><u>Site A: field south of 'Higher still', west of B3143</u></p> <p>Acceptable. Site reflects existing pattern of development, close to facilities, extra parking for shop could increase highway safety and reduce speed.</p> <p><u>Site B: Field to rear of 1-6 majors common on B3143 &amp; Site H: Field to the east of Landscombe Vale</u></p> <p>Against. Concentration of development, loss of gap between Hastoe houses, sloping sites</p> <p><u>Sites C/D: Land north of Lydden Meadow and Brooklands, on either side of the B3143</u></p> <p>Against Site C. Linear development, preference for one storey development. Against Site D, loss of gap between village and Duntish</p> <p><u>Site E: Field north of Brookfield, west of Parish Field</u></p> <p>Against. Proximity to school, traffic &amp; parking problems</p> <p><u>Site F: Land opposite Duntish Farm, east of B3143</u></p> <p>Preference redevelopment of the barn only, rich biodiversity</p> <p><u>Site I: Land at Knap Farm, off Lockett's Lane</u></p> <p>Against. Flooding and heavy traffic</p> <p><u>Site L: Land to north east of Knapps Hill Cottages, Spring Grove</u></p> <p>Against. Spoil character of area, preference development within curtilage of farm</p>
11	Kevin & Doug Morse	<p>Concerns such as traffic and flooding not addressed. Loss of wildlife and farm land to small holders. Insufficient biodiversity monitoring. Conflict of interest within steering group.</p> <p><u>Site B: Field to rear of 1-6 majors common on B3143 &amp; Site H: Field to the east of Landscombe Vale</u></p> <p>Highway safety (visibility splays, narrow exit onto Castle Lane)</p>
12	Lesley Docksey	<p>Questionnaires were rushed, inadequate consideration of the environment, over inflation of housing need, lack of minutes, non transparent financial accountability, lack of affordable housing, too much open market housing proposed, concerns raised in respect of the referendum process.</p>
13	M & D Higgs	<p><u>G3: Hountwell Pump</u></p> <p>Against designation of site as a local green space. Insufficient justification. A comprehensive list of all sites of interest</p>

Buckland Newton Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – March 2016

		within the local area. For example old quarry workings, common land (Sharnhill Green). Land already protected by AONB. Lack of public access. No clear boundaries.
14	John Stobart Natural England	Greenfield sites should be subject to a preliminary walk over ecological survey. Recommend the Plan is supported by a Dorset Environment Records Centre (DERC) records search. Identify the plan area's Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI). Site allocations greater than 0.1ha should be supported by a DCC approved biodiversity mitigation plan as required by Local Plan Policy ENV 1 and NPPF, paragraph 109.
15	Paul & Beverley Rose	<u>Site E: Field north of Brookfield, west of Parish Field</u> Inconsistency between policy requirement (2/3 bed) and developer proposal (3/4 bed). Site work has already begun before Independent examination.
16	S Stout & M Watts	Support affordable housing to the north of the village. There are too many building sites. Few opportunities for employment, limited public transport, lack of facilities. <u>Site A: field south of 'Higher still', west of B3143</u> Highway safety (Limited visibility, speeding traffic, shop traffic, pedestrian safety), drainage, fauna and flora (sparrows, barn owl).
17	Tom Shippey	Limited community engagement, poor communication, limited access to documentation, meetings have not been publically announced, no agendas or minutes, public meetings have been cancelled, distribution of newsletters, weighted plan options, loss of phasing policy. The dispersed pattern of the village means develop disproportionately effects some individuals, lack of due weight to those effected. Public consultation has been one sided. Poor rate of participation responses. Conflict of interest within the steering group. Consider lack of community participation, objections to sites and previous refusal of planning permission. Support more affordable housing, bungalows for retired people to downsize. Object to development that adversely affects houses already built, large 4 bed homes. <u>Site A: field south of 'Higher still', west of B3143, Site B: Field to rear of 1-6 majors common on B3143 &amp; Site H: Field to the east of Landscombe Vale</u> Object to sites A, B & H as over supply. B & H overlooking.
18	Tony Leyland	Plan does not address major issues of traffic management and flooding. Conflict of interest within the steering group. Although identification of plots and consideration were publically available, site selection, priority and demand profiles were not. Need for types of tenures have not been evidenced. The demand and balance of housing is skewed towards private ownership. Needs of young and elderly have not been met. The Plan does not adequately consider

		<p>the development potential at land north of Lydden Meadow. Other small infill sites will emerge. The village design should reflect its AONB designation and Dorset style of village. Clarify the future role of the Neighbourhood Plan group, other agencies and West Dorset District Council. Future referendum options should be made clear to residents.</p>
19	West Dorset District Council	<p><u>Policy H1: Location and Amount of New Housing</u>  Recommendation – The Defined Development Boundary (DDB) is extended to enclose open market housing sites adjacent the DDB.</p> <p><u>Policy H2: Type and Size of Housing</u>  Question inclusion of Space Standards, Accessibility and Adaptability Standards and removal of Permitted Development Rights.</p> <p><u>Policy H3: The Delivery of Affordable Housing</u>  Question the Plans definition of affordable homes, management of affordable housing and affordable housing requirement.</p> <p><u>Site A: field south of ‘Higher still’, west of B3143</u>  Support allocation.</p> <p><u>Site B: Field to Rear of 1-6 Majors Common on the B3143</u>  Support allocation.</p> <p><u>Site H: Field to the east of Landscombe Vale</u>  Extend DDB to include site, stronger justification is necessary to support this proposed site, demonstrate access.</p> <p><u>Sites C/D: Land north of Lydden Meadow and Brooklands, on either side of the B3143</u>  Support allocation. Clarify affordable housing phasing.</p> <p><u>Site E: Field north of Brookfield, west of Parish Field</u>  Support allocation. Consider comprehensive design approach.</p> <p><u>Site F: Land opposite Duntish Farm, east of B3143</u>  Due to the distance of the site from the main centre of Buckland Newton the Council has concerns as to whether the site contributes to achieving sustainable development.</p> <p><u>Site G: Old Farm Buildings, Brockampton Dairy Farm</u></p>

		<p>Greater consideration should be given to the viability of converting the buildings for affordable housing given the increased construction costs.</p> <p><u>Site I: Land at Knap Farm, off Lockett’s Lane</u></p> <p>Due to the distance of the site from the main centre of Buckland Newton the Council has concerns as to whether the site contributes to achieving sustainable development.</p> <p><u>Site J: Land adjacent to Lydden Cottage, Lockett’s Lane</u></p> <p>Recommendation – The DDB is extended to enclose open market housing sites adjacent the DDB. Due to the sites ‘gateway’ location into the Conservation area, site specific design criteria are recommended.</p> <p><u>Site K: Land south of the Old Mill, Duntish</u></p> <p>Due to the distance of the site from the main centre of Buckland Newton the Council has concerns as to whether the site contributes to achieving sustainable development and is in general conformity with the settlement strategy as set out in the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Site L: Land to north east of Knapps Hill Cottages, Spring Grove</u></p> <p>Due to the distance of the site from the main centre of Buckland Newton the Council has concerns as to whether the site contributes to achieving sustainable development and is in general conformity with the settlement strategy as set out in the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Policy TT1: Direction Signage</u></p> <p>Policy should reference ‘amenity’ and as worded may reduce options for the appropriate location of signage.</p> <p><u>Policy C3: New recreational space adjoining the parish field</u></p> <p>Potential to link the provision of the playing field with policy RES4.</p> <p><u>Appendix 1: Policy Maps</u></p> <p>Amend key to differentiate between general market housing and rural exception site. Allocations and designations should reference policy numbers. The key is missing the symbol for recreational space. Site I and G3 have not been plotted.</p> <p><u>Compliance with EU obligations – requirement for Strategic Environmental Assessment</u></p> <p>Buckland Newton Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to require a full SEA.</p>
20	William Carroll	Inadequate public consultation, lack of public meetings skewed questionnaire design and response weights. Promise

		<p>to influence prioritisation of order of projects was withdrawn. Plan has progressed with insufficient public support / low response rates.</p> <p><u>Site H: Field to the east of Landscombe Vale</u></p> <p>Nearby properties do not experience flooding issues since the introduction of a sump behind Post House Cottage. Site should be withdrawn.</p>
21	William Gueterbock	<p>The Plan promotes excessive building development and fails to consider the importance of environmental factors and the beauty of the village. Reference made to West Dorset 2000 – Survey of the Built and Natural Environment of West Dorset (February 2000). The steering group has not approached the Plan with an open mind. Conflict of interest within the steering group. Need for affordable housing. Empty properties in the village. People should live where they work. Proposed sites in general; increase local traffic, despoiling rural nature of the area and impinge on scenic environment of the Ludden Stream. The village location in the AONB is not properly described or considered in the Plan. No Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p><u>Sites D: Land north of Lydden Meadow</u></p> <p>Delete. Impinges on Lydden corridor and rural nature of the site.</p> <p><u>Site E: Field north of Brookfield, west of Parish Field</u></p> <p>Against. A wildlife corridor and important scenic location.</p> <p><u>Site F: Land opposite Duntish Farm, east of B3143</u></p> <p>Against. Traffic, flooding and loss of Biodiversity in the Ludden corridor.</p> <p><u>Site G: Old Farm Buildings, Brockampton Dairy Farm</u></p> <p>Careful consideration, impact on listed building and others in close proximity.</p> <p><u>Site H: Field to the east of Landscombe Vale</u></p> <p>Against. Close proximity to unregulated industry, flooding, increase in heavy traffic.</p> <p><u>Site J: Land adjacent to Lydden Cottage, Lockett's Lane</u></p> <p>Against. Soil structure likely to lead to poor drainage, increased traffic.</p> <p><u>Site K: Land south of the Old Mill, Duntish</u></p> <p>Against. Within the Lydden corridor, flooding, traffic.</p> <p><u>Site L: Land to north east of Knapps Hill Cottages, Spring Grove</u></p> <p>Against. Dangerous corner, traffic, impact on natural environment.</p>

