

Mr P Reese
Senior Planning Policy Officer
Planning and Community Services
Dorset Council

PCD/CF
17 June 2019

Dear Mr Reese

MOTCOMBE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

I thank you for your email of 11 June regarding the Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan.

I understand the points made in your email. However my client is concerned that he has sent information to the Motcombe Neighbourhood Plan Group but has received neither an acknowledgement nor a reply and he is very concerned that this information was not taken into account in reaching their recommendations. I enclose herewith copies of the documentation sent and some email copies. I would be grateful if these could be sent to the inspector or, at the very least, within the information made available to the inspector.

My clients feel strongly with regard to this matter, particularly in the lack of any audit trail of his representations.

Yours sincerely

Paul Dance DipTP MRTPI
For and on behalf of
Symonds & Sampson LLP

[Redacted signature line]

Enc



Symonds & Sampson LLP

[Redacted address line 1]
[Redacted address line 2]
[Redacted address line 3]

[Redacted address line 4]
[Redacted address line 5]

[Redacted address line 6]
[Redacted address line 7]

Symonds & Sampson LLP
is a Limited Liability Partnership
Registered in England & Wales
No OC326649
Registered Office: 30 High West St.
Dorchester DT1 1UP

Regulated by RICS

MOTCOMBE RESPONSE RE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

SITE 2 Score 2

Site is somewhat detached from main built up area of village-replacement of modern complex of farm buildings with a small scale sensitively designed scheme will be a visual improvement but will change character of area to more residential in appearance-may create pressure for housing on frontage opposite

SITE 4 Score 4

Significant frontage with any new housing appearing to be extensive ribboning- the landscape impact caused by loss of rural character is not given proper significance- little scope to create a layout of interest- concern that it could result in a suburban development with no visual benefit to the village

SITE 13 Score 2

Current planning application on site-planning policy officer of NDDC response is that given lack of 5 year housing supply the balance of considerations weighs in favour of the scheme- likely to be approved although will result in loss of views to the hills beyond village.

SITE 18 Score 3

Extension of built up area onto elevated site but with existing development opposite-loss of hedgerow will have adverse impact on rural character and once again this is not given sufficient weight- however new housing will be seen in relationship to existing dwellings so on balance acceptable subject to landscaping-once again however concern that suburban layout will result.

SITE 19 Score 2

Small frontage site- modest scale of development envisaged- little landscape impact- acceptable

SITE 20/21 Score 3

Undesirable extension of built form away from village- loss of strong rural character given lack of development on opposite side of road-loss of extensive open views to south towards hills which is a strong landscape characteristic of the village- concern that another suburban estate will result.

SITE 25 Score 1

Existing developed area close to village centre- backland site but with careful design, scale, siting and massing an enhancement should result.

Question 2

The criteria for the selection of sites is generally well founded but no weighting has been applied to each. There are certain criteria which are more important than others and it is considered that those two involving landscape impact have been underplayed. It would also appear that no landscape character analysis of the village has been carried out to assist the judgements for those two criteria. This is a significant failing with the individual site assessments only mentioning the landscape features on site without then assessing the landscape impact of new housing on the character of the village or its setting in the countryside. It is considered that in reality the landscape impact of some of the sites will be greater than SITE 5 which has currently been discounted. SITE 5 is a small site which lies between existing development. If developed it will reinforce the form of the village in that part of the village not be at variance with it. A modest properly laid out scheme will have less impact than other sites that have been recommended with views out to countryside being maintained as well as existing landscape features on site being retained given the frontage to two roads.

RESPONSE RE MOTCOMBE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN QUESTIONNAIRE

This response has been formulated by Clive Miller Planning Ltd, [REDACTED] on behalf of Mr and Mrs Bouchier. The sites set out in the initial assessment have been inspected and a perambulation of the village has been carried out. The following comments relate to the preferred sites.

QUESTION 1 of Questionnaire

SITE 2 Score 2

Site is somewhat detached from main built up area of village -replacement of modern complex of farm buildings with a small scale sensitively designed scheme will be a visual improvement but will change character of area to more residential in appearance -may create pressure for housing on frontage opposite.

SITE 4 Score 4

Significant frontage with any new housing appearing to be extensive ribboning- the landscape impact caused by loss of rural character is not given proper significance- little scope to create a layout of interest given frontage development only- concern that it could result in a suburban development with no visual benefit to the village.

SITE 13 Score 2

Current planning application on site-planning policy officer of NDDC response is that given lack of 5 year housing supply the balance of considerations weighs in favour of the scheme- likely to be approved although will result in loss of views to the hills beyond village.

SITE 18 Score 3

Extension of built up area onto elevated site but with existing development opposite -loss of hedgerow will have adverse impact on rural character and once again this is not given sufficient weight- however new housing will be seen in relationship to existing dwellings so on balance acceptable subject to landscaping -once again however concern that suburban layout will result.

SITE 19 Score 2

Small frontage site- modest scale of development envisaged- little landscape impact- acceptable

SITE 20/21 Score 3

Undesirable extension of built form away from village- loss of strong rural character given lack of development on opposite side of road-loss of extensive open views to south towards hills which is a strong landscape characteristic of the village- concern that another suburban estate will result.

SITE 25 Score 1

Existing developed area close to village centre- backland site but with careful design, scale, siting and massing an enhancement should result.

QUESTION TWO

The criteria for the selection of sites is generally well founded but no weighting has been applied to each. There are certain criteria which are more important than others and it is considered that those two involving landscape impact have been underplayed.

It would also appear that no landscape character analysis of the village has been carried out to assist the judgements for those two criteria. This is a significant failing with the individual site assessments only mentioning the landscape features on site without then assessing the landscape impact of new housing on the character of the village or its setting in the countryside.

It is considered that in reality the landscape impact of some of the sites will be greater than SITE 5 which has currently been discounted.

In this regard 88% of respondents to the previous questionnaire favoured infill by single houses not extensive frontage development in the form of ribboning.

SITE 5 is a small infill site which lies between existing development. If developed it will reinforce the form of the village in that part of the village not be at variance with it. A modest properly laid out scheme will have less impact than other sites that have been recommended with views out to countryside being largely maintained as well as existing landscape features on site being retained given the frontage to two roads and the consequent flexibility to provide a suitable access.

In looking at the reasons cited for the rejection of SITE 5 the one negative score under promoting a walkable village is not justified given that there is reasonable pedestrian access to the village hall and shop by Frog Lane and footpaths. Although such a criteria is of merit it also does not take into account that the NPPF clearly sets out that in rural areas sustainable transport solutions will vary compared to those in urban areas. This means that it is accepted that in practice there will be dependence on the car and this has been recognised by a recent Court of Appeal judgement.

In looking at the marginal reasons why SITE 5 was rejected it is also of note that the residents of three of the four properties adjacent work from home and have broadband availability.

In conclusion these two local residents welcome the opportunity to engage further in the Neighbourhood Plan process. However they are concerned that some of the chosen options are of a scale and nature which will not sit comfortably with the underlying objectives of the process. They feel that their modest site within the established framework of the village will not have the adverse impacts of other chosen sites.