



**Intelligent Plans**  
and examinations

# **Report on Wareham Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2034**

**An Examination undertaken for Dorset Council with the support of  
Wareham Town Council on the October 2020 submission version of the  
Plan.**

Independent Examiner: David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT

Date of Report: 9 June 2021

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL  
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

## Contents

	Page
<b>Main Findings - Executive Summary</b>	4
<b>1. Introduction and Background</b>	4
• Wareham Neighbourhood Plan 2019–2034	4
• The Independent Examiner	5
• The Scope of the Examination	5
• The Basic Conditions	6
<b>2. Approach to the Examination</b>	6
• Planning Policy Context	6
• Submitted Documents	7
• Site Visit	8
• Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	8
• Modifications	8
<b>3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights</b>	8
• Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	8
• Plan Period	8
• Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	8
• Development and Use of Land	9
• Excluded Development	9
• Human Rights	9
<b>4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions</b>	10
• EU Obligations	10
• Main Issues	10
• General Issues of Compliance of the Plan	10
- National Policy, Sustainable Development and the Development Plan	10
• Specific Issues of Compliance of the Plan's Policies	11
- Introduction	11
- Our Vision, Objectives and Themes	12
- Housing and Development (Policies H1 to H11)	12
- A Thriving Town Centre (Policies TC1 to TC7)	17
- A Pedestrian and Cycle Friendly Town (Policies PC1 to PC4)	18
- Local Green Spaces and Community Facilities (Policies GS1 to GS3)	22
- A Locally Distinctive and Sustainable Place (Policies LDP1 to LDP4)	24
• Key Projects, Monitoring and Review	25
• Other Matters	26

<b>5. Conclusions</b>	26
• Summary	26
• The Referendum and its Area	26
• Overview	26
<b>Appendix: Modifications</b>	28

## **Main Findings** - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Wareham Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan/WNP) and its supporting documentation including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Wareham Town Council;
- The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – Figure 1 on page (i) of the Plan;
- The Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect: 2019-2034; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to Referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

## **1. Introduction and Background**

### *Wareham Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2034*

- 1.1 Wareham is a town that is divided into two distinct parts. The main town lies between the flood plains of the Rivers Frome and Piddle, and these natural barriers have largely prevented the built-up area from extending significantly beyond the earthen ramparts that still enclose much of the historic town – other than to the west, where development has taken place along West Street.
- 1.2 To the north of the flood plain of the River Piddle lies the other area of development, that I shall refer to as North Wareham. This is a primarily residential area (with some employment and small-scale retail provision) to the north of the railway, where there was rapid expansion in the 1950s and 1960s. Although this area may not display the same visual characteristics as the main town, it is nevertheless a vibrant community, which through the North Wareham Action Group has been closely involved in the preparation of the WNP.
- 1.3 The task of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan for Wareham commenced in June 2015 (by Town Council resolution). A Steering Group was established and first met in October 2015.

### *The Independent Examiner*

- 1.4 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the WNP by Dorset Council, with the agreement of Wareham Town Council.
- 1.5 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector, with extensive experience in the preparation and examination of development plans and other planning policy documents, including examining the Purbeck District Local Plan Part 1 (adopted in 2012). I am an independent examiner, and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

### *The Scope of the Examination*

- 1.6 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
  - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
  - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.7 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ('the 1990 Act'). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.
  - Whether the Plan complies with provisions under s.38A and s.38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ('the 2004 Act'). These are:
    - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
    - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
    - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
    - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'; and
    - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.

- Whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the plan proceed to referendum.
  - Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)('the 2012 Regulations').
- 1.8 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

### *The Basic Conditions*

- 1.9 The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:
- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
  - Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
  - Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
  - Be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations (under retained EU law)<sup>1</sup>; and
  - Meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.
- 1.10 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.<sup>2</sup>

## **2. Approach to the Examination**

### *Planning Policy Context*

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Dorset Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is currently the Purbeck District Local Plan Part 1 which was formally adopted in November 2012.

---

<sup>1</sup> The existing body of environmental regulation is retained in UK law.

<sup>2</sup> This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

- 2.2 This will be superseded by the Purbeck Local Plan (2018-2034) (PLP) on its adoption (for which I am told by Dorset Council there is no estimated timescale).<sup>3</sup> The PLP is currently being examined and consultation on the proposed main modifications to that document ended in January 2021. Work has also commenced on the Dorset Council Local Plan and its publication is scheduled for September 2021, with submission in March 2022.<sup>4</sup> I am satisfied that the Town Council has worked with Dorset Council to minimise any conflict between the WNP and these two emerging plans in accordance with the advice given in the PPG.<sup>5</sup>
- 2.3 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. A revised NPPF was published on 19 February 2019, and all references in this report are to the February 2019 NPPF and its accompanying PPG.

### *Submitted Documents*

- 2.4 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including:
- the draft Wareham Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2034, October 2020;
  - Figure 1 of the Plan which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates;
  - the Consultation Statement, December 2020;
  - the Basic Conditions Statement, October 2020;
  - the 'Supporting Evidence' documents including the Local Green Spaces Background Paper, July 2018;
  - all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
  - the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)(AECOM Report), October 2020<sup>6</sup>;
  - the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)(AECOM Report), October 2020, and the HRA undertaken by Dorset Council, December 2020; and
  - responses from Dorset Council and Wareham Town Council received on 21 April 2021 and 22 April 2021 to my letter of 18 March 2021 and Wareham Town Council's response of 10 May 2021 to my further letter of 26 April 2021.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See Dorset Council's response to Examiner's Question 2.

<sup>4</sup> See Dorset Local Development Scheme: [www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning](http://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning)

<sup>5</sup> PPG Reference ID: 41-009-20190509.

<sup>6</sup> Dorset Council also undertook its own screening determination in December 2020, arriving at the same conclusion that both SEA and HRA were required: [wareham-neighbourhood-plan-sea-determination-statement-final-redacted.pdf](http://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/wareham-neighbourhood-plan-sea-determination-statement-final-redacted.pdf) ([www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk](http://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk))

<sup>7</sup> View at: <https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning-policy/purbeck/neighbourhood-planning-purbeck/wareham-neighbourhood-plan.aspx>

### *Site Visit*

- 2.5 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 24 March 2021 to familiarise myself with the locality, and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents, including Bog Lane Natural Greenspace, Stoborough.

### *Written Representations with or without Public Hearing*

- 2.6 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

### *Modifications*

- 2.7 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

## **3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights**

### *Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area*

- 3.1 The Wareham Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by Wareham Town Council, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by Purbeck District Council on 10 September 2015.
- 3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for Wareham and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

### *Plan Period*

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2019 to 2034.

### *Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation*

- 3.4 The Consultation Statement (December 2020) clearly and thoroughly summarises the wide range of consultation that has taken place. The process commenced in November/December 2015, with a press release, 2 drop-in sessions and a survey of residents. A communications and engagement strategy was prepared in February 2016. Consultation was undertaken on the options for future housing; stakeholder events were arranged, and further consultation was undertaken in 2017, including an employment survey and a workshop for local retailers.



- 3.5 In 2019 the first examination into the WNP commenced. However, in light of the Town Council's desire to make further amendments to the WNP, the WTC (on the advice of the examiner) resolved to withdraw the WNP, thus affording the opportunity to amend the document. This enabled further consideration to be given to Dorset Council's plans for the Middle School and Bonnets Lane sites, and also issues regarding nature conservation.
- 3.6 A Second pre-submission consultation (Regulation 14) was undertaken, initially in February/April 2020 but this was extended to June 2020 because of the Coronavirus pandemic. At all times appropriate publicity has been provided.
- 3.7 The consultation process has been thorough, and I am able to conclude that the opportunity to contribute to the plan preparation process has been available to all the interested parties at the relevant stages, including at both the Regulation 14 stage (28 February 2020 to 19 June 2020) and the Regulation 16 stage (18 December 2020 to 12 February 2021).
- 3.8 I am satisfied that all the relevant requirements in the 2012 Regulations have been met. I also consider that, in all respects, the approach taken towards the preparation of the WNP and the involvement of interested parties in consultation, has been conducted through a transparent, fair and inclusive process. The relevant PPG advice on plan preparation and community engagement has been heeded and the legal requirements have been met.

#### *Development and Use of Land*

- 3.9 Subject to my comments on Policy TC1 (see paragraph 4.39 below and PM15), the Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with s.38A of the 2004 Act.

#### *Excluded Development*

- 3.10 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'.

#### *Human Rights*

- 3.11 No party has raised issues regarding a breach of, or incompatibility with Human Rights and no representations have been submitted to that effect. From my independent assessment of the draft Plan and the supporting evidence, I am satisfied that proper regard has been given to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human rights and that the WNP complies with the Human Rights Act 1998.

## 4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

### *EU Obligations*

- 4.1 The Neighbourhood Plan was screened for SEA by Dorset Council and it was concluded that it was necessary to undertake an SEA.<sup>8</sup> Having read the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion, I support that conclusion.
- 4.2 The SEA dated October 2020 (prepared by AECOM) concludes that overall, long-term positive effects are anticipated as a result of the policies in the WNP.<sup>9</sup> I have considered the Strategic Environmental Assessment (AECOM Report) and from my independent assessment I concur with the findings in paragraphs 5.50-5.53 of the Environmental Statement.
- 4.3 A Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) was produced by AECOM in October 2020. This advises in paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3, that subject to amendments to policies H7, H11 and GS3, the policies of the WNP will not result in an adverse impact on the integrity of European sites, either alone or in combination with other projects or plans. The HRA undertaken by Dorset Council (December 2020) reaches the same conclusion (chapter 4 on page 28). I have seen no substantive evidence that would lead me to conclude otherwise.
- 4.4 I note that no objections to the content of the WNP were submitted by Natural England or by any other similar organisation and I am satisfied that the approach taken by the Town Council is appropriate.

### *Main Issues*

- 4.5 I have approached the assessment of compliance with the Basic Conditions of the Wareham Neighbourhood Plan as two main matters:
- General issues of compliance of the Plan, as a whole; and
  - Specific issues of compliance of the Plan policies.

### *General Issues of Compliance of the Plan*

#### National Policy, Sustainable Development and the Development Plan

- 4.6 Following on from an Introduction to the WNP and a section entitled 'Our Vision, Objectives and Themes', the policies in the WNP are set out under five main headings: Housing and Development; A Thriving Town Centre; A Pedestrian and Cycle Friendly Town; Local Green Spaces and Community Facilities; and A Locally Distinctive and Sustainable Place. There is also a final section that addresses Key Projects, Plan Monitoring and Review. The

---

<sup>8</sup> See Dorset Council's SEA Determination Statement (December 2020), which reinforces the need previously identified in the AECOM SEA report (October 2020).

<sup>9</sup> See paragraph 5.50 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (AECOM Report) (October 2020).

Basic Conditions Statement (October 2020) satisfactorily summarises how the policies in the WNP have had regard to national and strategic policies and EU obligations.

- 4.7 A key national objective is the achievement of sustainable development and, subject to the modifications that I recommend below, I am satisfied that all three elements of sustainable development (namely economic, social and environmental) have been appropriately taken into account in the formulation of the WNP. The Basic Conditions in this regard have been met.
- 4.8 Subject to the detailed comments that I set out below, I conclude that the WNP has had proper regard to national policy and guidance. I also conclude that, subject to the modifications that I recommend:
- The WNP is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Purbeck District Local Plan Part 1 and that overall, the document provides an appropriate framework that will ensure the satisfactory achievement of the Plan's stated objectives; and
  - That the policies (as modified) are supported by appropriate evidence, are sufficiently clear and unambiguous and that they can be applied with confidence.<sup>10</sup>
- 4.9 Concerns were expressed in representation WA10 regarding the relationship between the WNP and both the emerging PLP and the Dorset Council Local Plan. However, Dorset Council has confirmed that the policies in the WNP would not unduly influence or constrain any emerging policies in either Local Plan document. In any event there is no requirement, in circumstances such as this, to delay the preparation of the WNP and I am satisfied that the approach adopted by Wareham Town Council meets the Basic Conditions. It has been suggested (rep WA10) that the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of Wareham may need to be revised (because it is claimed that some of the proposed housing may not be deliverable) but I note that Dorset Council has confirmed that there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify a change to the Green Belt boundary at Wareham and on the evidence I have seen, I would agree.

### *Specific Issues of Compliance of the Plan's Policies*

#### Introduction (page 1)

- 4.10 The Introduction confirms that the Neighbourhood Plan Area was agreed by Purbeck District Council in September 2015. There is also a summary of the current situation regarding the review of the PLP. However, the relationship between the WNP and the other documents which comprise the Development Plan for the area is not clear. To add clarity the Town Council has suggested some additional wording<sup>11</sup> and an addition to

---

<sup>10</sup> PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

<sup>11</sup> See Town Council's response to Examiner's Question 1.

paragraph 1.2.2. I agree that a new paragraph and other additional text which addresses the relationship of the various documents in the Development Plan would be appropriate to aid clarity, in accordance with national advice<sup>12</sup>, and I recommend accordingly in **PM1**.

- 4.11 There follows a brief explanation of the history of the town and an acknowledgement that the floodplain of the River Piddle, the railway line and the by-pass have all contributed to Wareham being, in essence, a town divided into two parts. Section 1.4 (page 4) comments on the population and household characteristics of Wareham.
- 4.12 These introductory sections (as modified) provide a clear and succinct assessment of the evolution of the town and the characteristics that it displays today, together with a brief explanation of the relationship between the various planning documents.

#### Our Vision, Objectives and Themes (page 6)

- 4.13 This section focuses on the summary of the main issues of concern that were identified in the early public consultation exercises. The aspirations that are embedded in these identified issues have then provided the basis for the objectives that are set out in paragraph 3.3.3. This approach is clear. What is not so clear to me is why paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 have been inserted in this section. These paragraphs relate solely to the housing requirement for the town and do not stem specifically from the Town Council's vision or to the issues raised by the local community and would therefore be more appropriately located in chapter 3, entitled 'Housing and Development'. I therefore recommend in **PM2** that in the interests of clarity paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 be relocated at the start of chapter 3 (the subsequent paragraph numbers would have to be amended).

#### Housing and Development

##### Policy H1 Overall Housing Requirement (page 10)

- 4.14 The introductory paragraphs to this section satisfactorily explain the justification for the housing requirement of about 300 new dwellings in the Plan area between 2019 and 2034 and I note that Dorset Council has not objected to this number. Concerns were expressed about the delivery of the housing figure<sup>13</sup> and also about the windfall figure of 100 dwellings. However, I have seen no clear evidence that would lead me to conclude that the overall figure cannot be achieved or that the windfall figure is a significant over-estimate. I note that Dorset Council is confident that the sites will come forward and that the windfall sites are deliverable.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> See NPPF paragraph 16 d).

<sup>13</sup> See Regulation 16 response Ref WA10.

<sup>14</sup> See Dorset Council's response to Inspector's Question 3.

Policy H2 Housing Mix (page 12)

- 4.15 Policy H2 favours the provision of smaller houses and I am satisfied that this approach is justified by the evidence (for example, the Housing Needs Assessment).

Policy H3 Stock of Smaller Dwellings (page 12)

- 4.16 Policy H3 supports the subdivision of dwellings provided there is appropriate parking and amenity space and, particularly in a historic town such as Wareham, such an approach is justified and is in accordance with NPPF paragraph 127 which seeks to ensure that new development functions well and adds to the overall quality of the area. However, in a location such as Wareham it would be appropriate to add the qualification that any sub-division of dwellings should take into account relevant heritage policies and this is recommended in **PM3**.

Policy H4 Nationally, European and Internationally Important Wildlife Sites (page 15)

- 4.17 There is a reference in supporting text paragraph 3.3.1 (page 14) to protected heathland but only SAC (Special Area of Conservation) is mentioned. In the interests of completeness this reference should be expanded to include SPA (Special Protection Area) and Ramsar sites and this is recommended in **PM4**.
- 4.18 Policy H4 accurately reflects national advice in the NPPF.<sup>15</sup> Although, to some extent, it duplicates Policy BIO of the adopted Purbeck District Local Plan Part 1, I consider that a 'belt and braces' approach towards the protection of wildlife and habitats in such a precious part of Dorset (in terms of wildlife) is justified. On that basis and in the interests of clarity, I consider that the first sentence of the policy should be modified to include reference to Dorset Heathlands and Poole Harbour (**PM5**).
- 4.19 In paragraph 3.3.2 (page 16) there is a reference to support for Dorset becoming a National Park. In the interests of clarity, it should be confirmed that it is the support of the Town Council that is referred to and therefore I recommend **PM6**. In the same paragraph on page 17 Dorset Council suggest amended wording to better reflect national policy with regard to nature conservation and I agree that this would add clarity and therefore recommend accordingly in **PM7**.

Policy H5 Westminster Road (page 24)

- 4.20 Policy H5 provides support for the redevelopment of the southern part of the Westminster Road Industrial Estate for residential development and employment provision. As with all the housing allocations, there is no specific reference to the number of dwellings that could be accommodated

---

<sup>15</sup> See NPPF chapter 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.  
Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 3 Princes Street, Bath BA1 1HL  
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

on the site. These figures are given (for all the housing allocations) in Table 1 on page 18.

- 4.21 In the interests of clarity and to aid the decision maker, I recommend in **PM8**, that Policy H5 includes a specific reference to the figure of about 30 dwellings (I recommend similar modifications with regard to the other housing sites that are proposed in the Housing Chapter). This would be compatible with the approach adopted by the Inspector into the emerging PLP.<sup>16</sup>
- 4.22 On the evidence provided, I am satisfied that the presence of existing water infrastructure on the site can be appropriately addressed in any development proposals. I am also satisfied that the relationship between the existing employment premises and the proposed housing would be satisfactory (or could be made to be so), particularly in terms of residential amenity. I note that there has been no objection from Dorset Council's Environmental Health officers.
- 4.23 Paragraph 3.4.2 confirms that both the Westminster Road and Johns Road Industrial Estates were safeguarded as employment land in the 2012 Local Plan Part 1. However, this safeguarding has not been carried forward into the emerging PLP.<sup>17</sup> There is no reason that I am aware of to doubt that the removal of this designation will occur.

Policy H6 Johns Road (page 27)

- 4.24 This site is allocated for housing but in the interests of consistency (see paragraph 4.21 above) it should include a reference to accommodating about 15 dwellings and this is recommended in **PM9**. Having visited the site I agree that the retention of the existing trees along the road frontage is an important objective.
- 4.25 I consider that the relationship between the existing employment premises and the proposed housing would be satisfactory (or could be made to be so), particularly in terms of residential amenity. I note that there has been no objection from Dorset Council's Environmental Health officers.

Policy H7 Wareham Town Northern Gateway (page 29)

- 4.26 I consider that, in visual terms, this is an important site at the 'entrance' to the historic town and to that end I agree that the existing landmark building on the frontage of the gas works site should be retained and that any new development should be of an appropriate high quality design. The policy also satisfactorily addresses issues of flood risk, ground contamination, the retention of trees and heathland mitigation. As with

---

<sup>16</sup> See WTC response to Examiner's Question 15.

<sup>17</sup> See Policy EE1.

the other housing allocations I recommend that reference is made to the capacity of the site to accommodate about 20 dwellings (**PM10**).

- 4.27 Concerns were expressed regarding the delivery of this proposal (Rep WA10) but interest in the redevelopment of the site has been confirmed<sup>18</sup> and there is no reason to doubt that it will come forward for redevelopment. I am also satisfied that the presence of the existing pumping station would not restrict the potential development of the site.

Policy H8 Hospital and Health Centre Site (page 31)

- 4.28 Policy H8 proposes the redevelopment of the former Wareham Health Centre, Wareham Hospital and Ambulance Station. However, it is contingent on the relocation of the GP surgery. The Town Council confirms<sup>19</sup> that progress is being made on the various components of the proposal and that funding streams are currently being pursued to enable the implementation of the scheme. This appears to be a relatively complex proposal but there is currently no reason to doubt that it can be successfully achieved. This is clearly a situation where close monitoring of progress is required and I note the statement in paragraph 8.3.1 of the WNP which confirms the Town Council's commitment to monitoring and review.
- 4.29 For reasons of clarity and consistency, I recommend in **PM11** that reference is made in the policy to the site accommodating about 40 dwellings.
- 4.30 There is a water main that crosses the site but I have seen no evidence that would lead me to conclude that its presence cannot be satisfactorily addressed in any development proposals.
- 4.31 In the interests of clarity and flexibility, the word 'should' ought to be inserted in the last sentence of the policy's introductory section (**PM12**). Although Policy LDP2 addresses the design of new development outside the Wareham Conservation Area, I consider that the relationship between Site H8 (the former Hospital and Health Centre) and the conservation area is very significant and therefore should be reflected in the policy. I therefore recommend **PM13**.

Bog Lane SANG

- 4.32 Concerns were expressed by two respondents<sup>20</sup> regarding the suitability of the Bog Lane SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) to mitigate the effects of the proposed residential development in Wareham. I visited the SANG and whilst I acknowledge it is not in comfortable walking distance from the town and North Wareham, it is nevertheless relatively

---

<sup>18</sup> See Steering Group comments on the submitted representations.

<sup>19</sup> See WTC response to Examiner's Question 14.

<sup>20</sup> Ref WA10 and WA11.



easily accessible by car and cycle and is well signed. It provides an attractive location to visit. In circumstances such as is found at Wareham, the likelihood of identifying available and suitable SANG adjacent to existing or proposed development is slim. Therefore, I am satisfied that the Town Council's approach is justified and I note that there has been no objection from Natural England.

Policy H9 Settlement Boundary (page 33)

- 4.33 Policy H9 supports appropriate residential infilling within the settlement boundary, subject to a number of requirements. Such an approach accords with national advice (see NPPF chapters 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes; and 11: Making effective use of land) and is fully justified.

Policy H10 Parking Space (page 33)

- 4.34 I saw on my visit that there is a risk that the character and appearance of the historic town (particularly the Conservation Area) could be diminished by indiscriminate car parking. Whilst encouragement should be given to reducing the reliance on the car (thus in theory reducing the need for so much parking provision), I am satisfied that at the present time the Town Council is justified in seeking to secure dedicated parking spaces for new residential development within the Conservation Area.

Policy H11 Sandford Lane Employment Safeguarding (page 34)

- 4.35 Sandford Lane is the town's largest employment estate, and it is safeguarded for employment use in the adopted Purbeck District Local Plan Part One (Policy E: Employment and see also Table 2 in Section 6.5) and in the emerging PLP – Policy EE 1: Employment Land Supply. Paragraph 3.10.1 of the WNP confirms that the Town Council propose to amend the boundary of the Estate by excluding Dorset Council's Purbeck Connect centre. Dorset Council has objected to this boundary amendment, commenting that Sandford Lane is a strategic site and that therefore it is the responsibility of that Council to propose any boundary changes. Chapter 3 of the NPPF on plan-making makes it clear that issues of strategic importance should be addressed by strategic bodies and that neighbourhood plans should 'contain just non-strategic policies'.<sup>21</sup>
- 4.36 In the WTC response to the Examiner's Question 16, it is acknowledged by the Town Council 'that Sandford Lane industrial estate is strategic in its importance'. Whilst I understand the reasoning behind the Town Council's suggested amendments (the removal of the Purbeck Connect centre and Everdene House from the identified employment area), I consider that a consistent approach across Dorset, which follows the advice in the NPPF, needs to be adopted in order that there is clarity and fairness in the decision-making process. Although in this instance the proposed changes

---

<sup>21</sup> NPPF, paragraph 18.



could be considered relatively minor, they may nevertheless set an unjustified and undesirable precedent, which could embolden other Parish/Town Councils to propose changes that might not accord with the strategic aspirations of Dorset Council. To that end, I recommend in **PM14** that the boundary of the Sandford Lane Employment Estate is not amended (i.e. it continues to include the Purbeck Connect centre and Everdene House) and that the last sentence of paragraph 3.10.1 is deleted. The opportunity for the Town Council to seek the revision of the Estate's boundary is imminent, as part of the Dorset Council Local Plan preparation process.

- 4.37 Taking into account the proposed modifications, I am satisfied that national policies and advice have been heeded and that the other Basic Conditions have been met in the Housing and Development policies.

### A Thriving Town Centre

- 4.38 The town centre is an attractive environment which the Town Council and the local community correctly wish to protect and further enhance.

Policy TC1 The Town Centre Boundary (page 38)

- 4.39 Policy TC1, regarding the Town Centre boundary, is more a statement of fact rather than a land use policy. In the interests of brevity and clarity Policy TC1 should be deleted and subsumed into Policy TC2 and I recommend accordingly in **PM15**. As a consequence, the subsequent TC policy numbering should be amended.

Policy TC2 Safeguarding Retail Provision in the Town Centre (page 39)

- 4.40 Policy TC2 provides support for appropriate retail provision in the Town Centre and as amended to incorporate Policy TC1 (see paragraph 4.39 above) meets the guidance in the NPPF. However, in the interests of clarity, the policy would benefit from including a cross-reference to the Policies Map and I recommend accordingly in **PM16**.

Policy TC3 Protecting Vitality and Viability of Carey Road Shops (page 40)

- 4.41 Carey Road Local Centre provides the main opportunity for shopping within the North Wareham area and as such the desire of the Town Council and the local community to ensure that it remains operational is well founded.

Policy TC4 Resisting Out of Town Retail Class A Floorspace (page 41)

- 4.42 I have not been made aware of any current proposals to provide further retail floorspace in the town. However, the Town Council is right to place the emphasis on retaining the existing vitality and viability of the Town Centre and the Carey Road Local Centre. Policy TC4 reflects the advice in chapter 7 of the NPPF (Ensuring the vitality of town centres) and I am

satisfied that the policy is fully justified in these circumstances. However, the policy title on page 41 refers to 'Class A' floorspace which, from 1 September 2020, is no longer a statutory use class and is to be treated as new 'Class E'. I note the reference to the policy in the index (Contents, page iv) omits the out of date reference and the policy text itself correctly refers to new Class E. Therefore, I recommend that the erroneous reference in the policy title on page 41 should be deleted (**PM17**).<sup>22</sup>

*Policy TC5 Maintaining and Enhancing the Public Realm (page 41)*

- 4.43 The protection and enhancement of the public realm in the Conservation Area is an important aspiration (see NPPF chapter 16) and I agree that it can contribute towards maintaining the vitality and viability of the town centre. Policy TC5 is justified.

*Policy TC6 Maintaining and Enhancing the Street Scene (page 42)*

- 4.44 The contribution that the appearance of the town centre shopfronts make to the character of the town centre is significant. Whilst Policy TC6 could be considered to be unduly inflexible I consider that, in a location such as Wareham, such a rigid approach to maintaining and enhancing the street scene is justified and meets the advice on conserving and enhancing the historic environment in the NPPF (chapter 16). In any event I note the use of the word 'should' in the policy.

*Policy TC7 Protecting Town Centre Car Parks and Garages (page 44)*

- 4.45 Paragraph 4.7.3 confirms that many stakeholders consider parking within Wareham Town Centre to be adequate. Nevertheless, there are few opportunities to provide additional parking (for both residents and visitors) should demand increase. Therefore, the Town Council is keen to ensure that existing car parks and garage blocks are retained unless suitable provision can be made elsewhere. In the circumstances, this appears to be a justified approach.
- 4.46 As proposed to be modified, it is clear to me that the Town Centre policies will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and meet the other Basic Conditions.

A Pedestrian and Cycle Friendly Town

- 4.47 The promotion of walking, cycling and the use of public transport is a key national objective and it is clear that, in particular, the local community values foot and cycle links, including over the railway lines by Wareham railway station. Because of the significance of the level crossing to the local community, I start by addressing that issue.

---

<sup>22</sup> [Use Classes | Change of use | Planning Portal](#)

## The Pedestrian Level Crossing at Wareham Station

- 4.48 There is only one direct link for walkers and cyclists travelling between North Wareham and the town centre. About half of the town's population live on the north side of the railway, yet the schools, the main shops and the recreation and health facilities are on the south side. The route includes the controlled pedestrian crossing immediately to the east of the railway station and at the time of my visit the crossing was being well used by walkers, despite the fairly lengthy time the gates were shut prior to a train arriving.
- 4.49 It is clear from the evidence submitted, including the Wareham Railway Crossing Briefing Paper (dated January 2020), that the retention of the pedestrian crossing over the railway has widespread community support and it is reasonable in every respect for the Town Council to reflect this support in the WNP. The Briefing Paper suggests that there are about 1,200 crossings made daily and it is confirmed that there has never been an accident or fatality at the crossing.
- 4.50 In the interest of safety and to remove the need to have a crossing gate controller, alternative proposals have been considered in the past, including the construction of a new ramped bridge, but this was rejected by Dorset County Council and the former Purbeck District Council. Consideration has also been given to several other options, including the provision of a ramped access to the existing footbridge; the provision of lifts at the station; the construction of a subway; the provision of automatic barriers; and a shared use footway/cycleway adjacent to the A351 Wareham by-pass.
- 4.51 No suitable option has been agreed and I note that the WNP (paragraph 5.1.3) confirms that, in part, this is because the station buildings and footbridge are listed buildings. I have not seen all the historical evidence on this issue but taking into account the views of the local community and the Town Council, my initial opinion is that any option involving significant construction works would be difficult to successfully achieve, particularly because in visual terms it would be difficult to integrate such significant development into the character of the locality whilst respecting the setting of the listed station.
- 4.52 Dorset Council, in response to my Question 1, has confirmed that a pedestrian/cycle route alongside the A351 is scheduled for commencement in Autumn 2021. However, I agree with the Town Council that this should not be seen as an alternative to the foot crossing at the railway station. It is a significantly longer route; it is not level; it would run beside the busy A351; and it would not cater for those with mobility impairments wishing to change platforms at the station.
- 4.53 The WNP confirms that one option could be to link the operation of barriers/gates to the signalling system. I understand that Network Rail has concluded that 'a safe automated solution is not available for this

site'.<sup>23</sup> It is suggested that there is a risk of pedestrians becoming trapped 'lineside' or being struck by a descending barrier. I have seen no evidence that quantifies these risks and at this stage the approach being advocated by the Town Council would seem to me to be an appropriate starting point. Such an approach would also appear to accord with the legal advice obtained by the Town Council.<sup>24</sup>

- 4.54 I have seen no substantive evidence regarding the costs of retaining the existing foot-crossing, but I do note that the lease agreement between Dorset Council and Network Rail comes to an end in 2038. This would appear to provide ample time for further consideration of the issues involved and I note that the Town Council makes reference<sup>25</sup> to meetings between Network Rail and Dorset Council (to discuss a technical solution to the issue) that were to have taken place last year but were cancelled because of the lockdown.
- 4.55 The Town Council has confirmed that Network Rail have been consulted a number of times regarding the level crossing<sup>26</sup> but as far as I am aware no response has been submitted. The Government has announced an overhaul of the management of the railways and this may provide the opportunity for further consideration to be given to this issue.
- 4.56 It is against the background summarised above, that I have considered the policies in this chapter of the WNP.

Policy PC1 Key Pedestrian and Cycling Routes (page 48)

- 4.57 Policy PC1 seeks the retention of the existing pedestrian and cycle routes (including the surface level crossing) and provides support for their improvement. Bearing in mind the need to travel sustainably<sup>27</sup>, this is a reasonable approach to take.
- 4.58 Dorset Council, in their response to my Question 1, suggests amended wording to Policy PC1 which does not refer to the retention of the surface level crossing. Such a modification would not accurately reflect the reasonable aspirations of the Town Council and the local community, and (as I summarise in the paragraphs above) there is currently insufficient evidence to justify my recommending such a change.
- 4.59 It is also suggested by Dorset Council that the proposed pedestrian/cycle route alongside the A351 between North Wareham and the town centre should be identified on Figure 38, but that plan is purely informative and identifies *existing* pedestrian and cyclist routes. Also, it is not clear to me what the exact status of the proposal is, for example I have not been

---

<sup>23</sup> See Dorset Council's response to Examiner's Question 1(d).

<sup>24</sup> From Sasha White QC (dated 4 October 2018).

<sup>25</sup> Town Council's comments (dated 29 April 2021) on Dorset Council's response to Examiner's Question 1.

<sup>26</sup> See response to Examiner's Question 20.

<sup>27</sup> NPPF, chapter 9.

advised about any consultation about the route. On that basis I consider it to be a matter to be addressed in the first review of the WNP.

#### Policy PC2 Pedestrian and Cycle Routes Improvements (page 49)

- 4.60 Improvements to the identified pedestrian and cycle routes and associated infrastructure are set out in Policy PC2. They are reasonable expectations which it would be appropriate to fund through Section 106/Community Infrastructure Levy expenditure. Dorset Council suggested that the list should be prioritised<sup>28</sup>, but this would remove an element of flexibility, which bearing in mind the significant potential costs of the proposed improvements, it would be prudent to retain.

#### Policy PC3 Sustainable Transport (page 49)

- 4.61 Paragraphs 5.1.6 and 5.1.7 explain the objective of the Swanage Railway Company to restore the rail link between Swanage and Wareham and it is suggested in the WNP that, for ease of operation, the former bay platform on the north side of the railway station could be re-opened for use by trains between Swanage and Wareham. To that end, it is proposed to safeguard the use of the former platform (subject to the consideration of the sand lizard population). However, the policy implies to me that any sustainable transport use of the land would be supported. This in turn could have consequences for the use of the land by Swanage Railway. In order to clarify the situation, the Town Council has agreed that the policy should be re-worded, with a small amendment to paragraph 5.1.7.<sup>29</sup> I consider that this will add clarity and recommend accordingly in **PM18**.

#### Policy PC4 Parking at Wareham Railway Station (page 50)

- 4.62 I saw on my visit that although there is parking at the railway station, this may not be sufficient to accommodate both local rail users and visitors who wish to travel on the Swanage Railway. In my experience, at certain times of the year, steam railways can generate significant levels of vehicular traffic. It is therefore prudent that the former sidings on the north side of the railway line (east of the station) are safeguarded for future parking use should they be declared surplus to operational requirements. Policy PC4 is therefore justified.
- 4.63 The objective of achieving a pedestrian and cycle friendly town is important in the interests of sustainability and conforms with national advice. As modified, the policies for a Pedestrian and Cycle Friendly Town meet the Basic Conditions.

---

<sup>28</sup> In Dorset's Regulation 16 response (representation WA14).

<sup>29</sup> See response to Examiner's Question 21.

## Local Green Spaces and Community Facilities

### Policy GS1 Protection of Local Green Spaces (page 54)

- 4.64 A significant number of Local Green Spaces are identified in Policy GS1. Policy GS1 designates 15 Local Green Spaces (LGS) which are described in Figure 43 and shown on Figure 45 (page 54). The NPPF states that LGS should satisfy following criteria: LGS designation should only be used where the green space is:
- a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
  - b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
  - c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.
- 4.65 I have visited these 15 sites and I recommend that, having regard to NPPF paragraphs 99-100, the guidance in the PPG and the Local Green Spaces Background Paper, 14 of the sites identified within the Policy (Sites A-N) should be designated as LGS in that they meet the criteria for designation.
- 4.66 However, with regard to the Castle Close garden (site O on Figure 45), which is in private ownership, it has transpired that the owners of this land had not been notified of the proposed designation. I therefore requested the Town Council to advise the owners about this proposed designation and to seek their comments.
- 4.67 The land-owners involved all objected strongly to the proposed designation and the Town Council subsequently requested withdrawal of the site as a proposed LGS.<sup>30</sup> It is clear that sufficient regard has not been had to the advice in the PPG<sup>31</sup> to enable these objections to be appropriately addressed at an earlier stage and, in any event, the site sits within the Wareham Conservation Area which already affords some additional protection. Taking all of this into consideration, I recommend in **PM19** the deletion of Local Green Space O (Castle Close garden).
- 4.68 Turning to the phrasing of Policy GS1, policies for managing development within a LGS should be consistent with those for Green Belts (NPPF paragraph 101). National guidance is that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Therefore, I shall recommend a modification of the policy to make it consistent with the management of development in the Green Belt (**PM19**).

---

<sup>30</sup> [combined-responses-to-lgs-consultation-210510-redacted.pdf \(dorsetcouncil.gov.uk\)](#)

<sup>31</sup> PPG Reference ID: 37-019-20140306.



Policy GS2 Proposed Health Care and Housing Hub (former Middle School site) (page 56)

- 4.69 Policy GS2 relates to the former Wareham Middle School site and proposes a new health care and housing hub for the town. The policy establishes the requirements for the development of the land, and I consider that they are all reasonable and justified. I note that neither Policy GS2 (Middle School site) or GS3 (Bonnets Lane site) stipulate the specific number of dwellings anticipated from each site. Rather the expectation is for the delivery of 100 units over the two sites. These two sites are included in the chapter that considers Community Facilities (rather than Housing) and paragraph 6.2.5 explains the aspirations of Dorset Council and Dorset Healthcare with regard to their development. This is clearly a relatively complex situation with a number of stakeholders involved and, on that basis, I consider it reasonable to refer only in the supporting text to the redevelopment of the two sites resulting in the net gain of at least 100 dwellings. This provides a small element of flexibility should it be found that a co-ordinated and cohesive approach to the implementation of the proposals is difficult to successfully achieve. I note, in the Town Council's response to my initial Questions, that significant work has already been undertaken with regard to implementing this proposal and there is currently no reason to doubt that the objectives of both Dorset Council and Wareham Town Council will be successfully achieved.
- 4.70 In the interests of clarity I agree with the Town Council<sup>32</sup> that reference to a mix of residential uses should be specifically included in a bullet point, rather than in the introductory sentence. I recommend this modification in **PM20**.
- 4.71 The supporting text to the policy, in paragraph 6.2.5 refers to work being undertaken in phases as funding becomes available. Dorset Council has confirmed, however, that this is an inaccurate statement because the phasing would not be related to funding. It is therefore recommended that the text be modified accordingly (**PM21**).
- 4.72 In the interests of clarity and to introduce greater flexibility, it is recommended that in the first sentence of the third paragraph of policy GS2 (which starts 'New development ...') the word 'should' ought to be inserted before 'conform' (**PM22**).

Policy GS3 Proposed Affordable and Extra Care Housing (Bonnets Lane site) (page 58)

- 4.73 The Bonnets Lane site currently includes a local authority owned care home and day centre. These are important community facilities which it is anticipated will relocate to the former Middle School site, as set out in Policy GS2. The Bonnets Lane site is an important component in the fabric

---

<sup>32</sup> See response to Examiner's Question 19.

of the Wareham Conservation Area and it is right that emphasis should be placed on ensuring that any redevelopment is of a high design standard. In these circumstances it is appropriate that the starting point is the conformity of development with the stated principles of development, as set out in Policy GS3.

- 4.74 With recommended modifications PM19-PM21, the Town Council's approach towards local green spaces and community facilities has regard to national policies and advice (for example in NPPF chapter 8) and meets the other Basic Conditions.

#### A Locally Distinctive and Sustainable Place

Policy LDP1 Design of New Development within Wareham Conservation Area (page 64)

- 4.75 It is one of the objectives of the WNP to protect local character and it is clear that local residents' value the strong character of the town and its setting. In the interests of clarity and completeness, it is recommended that in the fifth bullet point, relating to plot sizes, reference should be made to both widths and depths (**PM23**).
- 4.76 With regard to Dorset Council's suggestion to delete the reference to paving having to be natural stone, I note that in the Purbeck Townscape Character Appraisal (under 'Opportunities') it refers to replacing modern paving with more traditional materials in key locations. However, I agree that it may not always be desirable or feasible and therefore I recommend that bullet point 6 of the policy should be clarified by the insertion of the words 'where appropriate'. This is recommended in **PM24**.
- 4.77 I do not consider that any other potential changes to this policy are necessary to meet the Basic Conditions. In any event, I note that the policy only *supports* adherence to the listed criteria in the policy and there is no suggestion that it is mandatory that they are all met. In a location such as Wareham I consider it is reasonable for the Town Council to set out its high aspirations for the design of new development in this way.
- 4.78 I am satisfied that the content of Policy LDP1, as proposed to be modified, meets the Basic Conditions and that the policy will ensure that the historic environment is conserved and enhanced as set out in chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Policy LDP2 Design of New Development outside Wareham Conservation Area (page 65)

- 4.79 The first bullet point in the policy specifically refers to the Seven Barrows Ancient Monument. Dorset Council confirms, however, that there are other relevant designated heritage assets.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, I recommend in

---

<sup>33</sup> Dorset Regulation 16 response (representation WA14).



**PM25** that reference to designated heritage assets and their settings should be included in the first bullet point.

- 4.80 Dorset Council suggested (representation WA14) that the fifth bullet point should be amended with the deletion of references to 'walls, hedges or railings'. I consider that the appearance of public spaces is an important objective and having visited both the historic town and North Wareham I assess that the boundary treatment with regard to public space is an important consideration. NPPF chapter 12 confirms that development should add to the quality of an area and be visually attractive. The Town Council's approach on this matter is justified.

LDP3 Sustainable Design (page 66)

- 4.81 Policy LDP3 clearly establishes the way in which new development should contribute to tackling climate change. However, in order to aid clarity, it is recommended that a footnote is inserted after the words 'recycling storage' (in the eighth bullet point of the policy) to refer to Policy 22 of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole adopted Waste Plan regarding waste from new development. This is recommended in **PM26**.
- 4.82 In the interests of flexibility, Dorset Council suggests the insertion of 'where practicable' in the fourth and seventh bullet points of policy LDP3 and I agree that this would provide an appropriate level of flexibility. **PM27** is therefore recommended.

LDP4 Wareham Station Approaches Enhancement Area (page 67)

- 4.83 In the interests of clarity, the fact that Wareham station is a grade II listed building should be confirmed in the policy. I therefore recommend **PM28**.
- 4.84 It is important that the distinctive character of Wareham is retained and the policies in the WNP will significantly contribute towards achieving that objective. As proposed to be modified, the policies for A Locally Distinctive and Sustainable Place will meet the Basic Conditions

#### *Key Projects, Monitoring and Review*

- 4.85 Chapter 8 clearly sets out the role of Wareham Town Council with regard to two key projects – Wareham station improvements and the delivery of the health and housing hub. It also commits the Town Council to undertaking the monitoring and review of the Neighbourhood Plan. Bearing in mind the potential changes to the Development Plan in the emerging PLP and Dorset Council Local Plan, it is important that there is sufficient flexibility in the monitoring process to accommodate any significant changes to the planning framework for the town. To that end, I recommend in **PM29** the insertion of the words 'at least' at the start of paragraph 8.3.3.

## *Other Matters*

- 4.86 Dorset Council has identified a few minor points at the end of its representation WA14. They mainly relate to presentational matters which, although not of significant concern in terms of meeting the Basic Conditions, would add to the quality of the document. The Town Council may like to address these amendments as appropriate.

## **5. Conclusions**

### *Summary*

- 5.1 The Wareham Neighbourhood Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

### *The Referendum and its Area*

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. I conclude that the WNP, as modified, has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

### *Overview*

- 5.4 The WNP is a very well presented document which is written in a clear style and which contains plans that are easily decipherable. It is evident that significant effort has been made to ensure that all interested parties have been given the opportunity to partake in the plan making process and consequently the resultant document is one that I consider appropriately reflects the land use aspirations of the local community.
- 5.5 Wareham is an important historic town at the gateway to the Isle of Purbeck and it sits within an attractive setting. I am confident that the WNP will assist in the protection of those qualities which are valued by local residents and visitors alike, whilst at the same time enabling appropriate development to take place. The Neighbourhood Plan, if made,

will become an important component in the Development Plan and will contribute to providing a clear land use policy base for the area.



Examiner

## Appendix: Modifications (29)

Note: Additions are shown in **bold** and deletions are show in ~~strikethrough~~.

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
PM1	Page 1 Paragraph 1.2.1	<p>Insert new paragraph after 1.2.1 to read:</p> <p><b>The Neighbourhood Plan, once made, will form part of the development plan for the area, alongside the adopted Purbeck District Local Plan Part 1 and the Minerals and Waste Plans. At the time of the examination of this Plan, a new Purbeck Local Plan has been produced and is being examined. The examination hearing sessions into the soundness of that Plan took place between July and October 2019 and the Inspector has indicated that she is 'reasonably satisfied that with Main Modifications the Plan is likely to be capable of being found legally compliant and sound'. This 'new' Local Plan, in turn, is expected to be replaced by the Dorset Council Local Plan in 2023. The Town Council has worked with Dorset Council to minimise any conflict between the two plans, but should such conflict arise, it will be the latest adopted or 'made' plan that will take precedence in decision making.</b></p> <p>Alter subsequent paragraph numbers.</p>
PM2	Page 6 Paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2	Relocate paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 and their 'Heading' to the start of chapter 3.
PM3	Page 12	Add the following words at the end of the policy:

	Policy H3	<b>and subject to compliance with relevant heritage policies.</b>
PM4	Page 14 Paragraph 3.3.1	Modify third sentence at top of page 14 to read:  Within 400m of a protected heathland site (SAC, <b>SPA and Ramsar</b> ) residential development ....
PM5	Page 15 Policy H4	Modify the title of Policy H4 as follows:  Nationally, European and Internationally Important Wildlife Sites ( <b>including Dorset heathlands and Poole Harbour</b> ) and protected species and locally important habitats.
PM6	Page 16 Paragraph 3.3.2	In third sentence at the top of page 16 change the wording to read:  This is strongly supported <b>by the Town Council</b> , and the boundary .....
PM7	Page 17 Paragraph 3.3.2 (section on conservation)	Modify last part to read:  .... Great weight should be given to these assets' conservation and <del>substantial harm to their significance (which includes any impact on their setting) must be avoided.</del> <b>any harm to their significance (including any contribution made by their setting) should require clear and convincing justification.</b>
PM8	Page 24 Policy H5	Modify the first sentence to read:  The redevelopment of the southern part of the Westminster Road Industrial Estate for residential development ( <b>about 30 dwellings</b> ) plus employment, will be supported.
PM9	Page 27 Policy H6	Modify the first sentence to read:  The redevelopment of the industrial land on the north side of Johns Road for residential development ( <b>about 15 dwellings</b> ) will be supported ...

PM10	Page 29 Policy H7	Modify the first sentence to read: The redevelopment of the former gasworks site and Autopoint garage site for residential development ( <b>about 20 dwellings</b> ) will be supported .....
PM11	Page 31 Policy H8	Modify the first sentence to read: Provided that the GP surgery is relocated, the redevelopment for residential development ( <b>about 40 dwellings</b> ) of the former .....
PM12	Page 31 Policy H8	Modify the end of the last sentence of the introductory paragraph to read: And <b>should</b> conform with the following principles of development (illustrated in Figure 29):
PM13	Page 31 Policy H8	Add a new final bullet point to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Respect the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.</b></li></ul>
PM14	Page 34 Paragraph 3.10.1 Policies Map	Delete the last sentence of paragraph 3.10.1: <del>The western boundary of the safeguarding area has been drawn to exclude Dorset Council's Purbeck Connect centre which caters for adults with learning and physical disabilities and may in the future become available for residential development.</del> Modify the Policies Map on page 20 so that the safeguarded employment land at Sandford Lane continues to include the Purbeck Connect centre and Everdene House.
PM15	Page 38	Delete Policy TC1 Subsequent Town Centre policy numbers will have to be amended accordingly.
PM16	Page 39 Policy TC2	Modify the first sentence of Policy TC2 to read:

		Development within the Town Centre <b>(which is defined on the Policies Map Inset 2)</b> will be supported if .....
PM17	Page 41 Policy TC4	Modify the title of Policy TC4 to read: Resisting Out of Town Retail <del>Class A</del> Floorspace.
PM18	Page 49 Policy PC3 Paragraph 5.1.7	Modify first sentence of Policy PC3 to read: The bay platform at Wareham Station as indicated on the Policy Map, shall be safeguarded for <del>uses that support sustainable transport</del> <b>possible future use by trains to and from Swanage. In the interim,</b> uses that support sustainable transport <b>will be supported provided they do not compromise future rail use.</b>  Make a consequential revision to the text of paragraph 5.1.7 to reflect the modified policy.
PM19	Page 53-54 Figure 43 and Policy GS1	Delete the Castle Close Garden site from Figure 43.  Delete site O (Castle Close Garden) from Policy GS1 and Figure 45 (page 54).  Modify the first sentence of Policy GS1 to read:  <del>Development other than works to preserve their recreational function and openness will be strongly resisted</del> <b>will only be considered in line with national planning policy on Green Belts</b> on the following protected Local Green Spaces within the Town shown on the Policies Map:
PM20	Page 56 Policy GS2	Modify the start of the policy and insert a new bullet point to read:  Development of the area of the former Wareham Middle School buildings, playgrounds and parking areas, as a new HealthCare and Housing Hub for the

		<p>Town and surrounding area, <del>which may include extra care housing, key worker housing, a care home facility and affordable housing,</del> will be supported subject to the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• space for the relocated Wareham GP Surgery and ambulance Station, on the former Middle School site with a view to providing improved primary health care facilities;</li> <li>• <b>residential uses catering for health related needs and key healthcare worker accommodation, which may include extra care housing, a care home facility and/or affordable housing;</b></li> <li>• sufficient parking space .....</li> </ul>
PM21	Page 55 Paragraph 6.2.5	<p>Modify the end of the second sentence to read :</p> <p>..... does not compromise the development of the hub, <b>which may be undertaken in phases.</b> <del>which would need to be undertaken in phases as funding becomes available.</del></p>
PM22	Page 58 Policy GS3	<p>Modify the end of the second sentence to read:</p> <p>.... and <b>should</b> conform with the following principles of development (illustrated in figure 48):</p>
PM23	Page 64 Policy LDP1	<p>Modify the fifth bullet point to read:</p> <p>Buildings should articulate established plot widths <b>and depths</b> to establish a rhythm to the architecture in a street.</p>
PM24	Page 64 Policy LDP1	<p>Modify last sentence of the sixth bullet point to read:</p> <p>Paving should be natural stone <b>where appropriate;</b></p>
PM25	Page 65	<p>Modify first bullet point to read:</p>



	Policy LDP2	Respect site qualities/characteristics of the area including topography, slopes, Seven Barrows Ancient Monument <del>and its setting,</del> <b>and other designated heritage assets and their settings;</b>
PM26	Page 66 Policy LDP3	Insert a <u>footnote</u> after the words 'recycling storage' in the eighth bullet point to read:  <b>See Policy 22 of the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Waste Plan.</b>
PM27	Page 66 Policy LDP3	Modify the fourth and seventh bullet points to start:  <b>where practical .....</b>
PM28	Page 67 Policy LDP4	Modify the start of the policy to read: The area around the Station ( <b>which is a Grade II listed building</b> ) and its approaches ....
PM29	Page 69 Paragraph 8.3.3	Modify the start of the paragraph to read:  <b>At least e</b> Every five years ...