For office use only
Batch number:
Representor ID #
Representation #

Received:	
Ack:	



### FONTMELL MAGNA NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Regulation 16 Consultation 27 April to 8 June 2018

## **Response Form**

The proposed Fontmell Magna Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted to North Dorset District Council for examination. The neighbourhood plan and all supporting documentation can be viewed on the District Council's website via: <a href="https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning/north-dorset/planning-policy">www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning/north-dorset/planning-policy</a>

#### Please return completed forms to:

Email: planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy (North Dorset), South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, Dorset, DT1 1UZ

Deadline: 4pm on Friday 8 June 2018. Representations received after this date will not be accepted.

### Part A – Personal Details

This part of the form must be completed by all people making representations as **anonymous comments cannot be accepted.** By submitting this response form you consent to your information being disclosed to third parties for this purpose, personal details will not be visible on our website, although they will be shown on paper copies that will be sent to the independent examiner and available for inspection. Your information will be retained by the Council in line with its retention schedule. Your data will be destroyed when the plan becomes redundant.

\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes to the personal details but complete the full contact details of the agent. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

	Personal Details (if applicable)*	Agent's Details (if applicable)*
Title		Mr
First Name		Diccon
Last Name		Carpendale
Job Title		Partner (Planning Consultant)
(where relevant)		
Organisation		Brimble Lea & Partners
(where relevant)		
Address		
Postcode		
Tel. No.		
Email Address		

### Part B – Representation

#### **1.** To which document does the comment relate? *Please tick one box only.*

Submission Plan	
Consultation Stateme	nt
Basic Conditions Statement	
Other Please specif	v: SEA

# **2.** To which part of the document does the comment relate? Please identify the text that you are commenting on, where appropriate.

	Location of Text	
Whole document	X	
Section		
Policy		
Page		
Appendix		

#### **3.** Do you wish to? Please tick one box only.

	Support
Х	Object
	Make an observation

#### 4. Please use the box below to give reasons for your support/objection or make your observation.

The SEA sustainability appraisal process is considered to be flawed.

For reasons set out in other objections, assessing that sites 10.2 and 10.3 would have a significant adverse impact because of their position on the eastern side of the village and visibility from the AONB has been overstated and runs counter to comments made by the competent authority (AONB Partnership).

With respect to site 10.2 (Middle Farm Dutch Barn) the assessment of significant adverse impact likely in relation to landscape is not supported by the comments from the AONB Partnership. Proximity to the AONB cannot be a reason for dismissing development potential.

In relation to climatic factors the site has been assessed as adverse impact likely on the basis of possible seasonal ground water and surface water flooding – despite the flood risk undertaken by the competent authority not identifying any concerns in this regard. With respect to walking to community facilities, the Highway Authority has raised no objection.

As a consequence, both factors have been assessed in an unduly critical fashion.

Similarly, with regard to site 10.3 visibility from the AONB (which the AONB Partnership has not indicated should preclude development on this site) has been overstated.

In relation to this site no specific safety concerns are identified in terms of material assets which runs counter to the assessment of site 10.2.

There is a similar inconsistency between the assessment of 10.2 and 10.3 with respect to both cultural heritage and climatic factors. Again the ranking of each site is inconsistent but also unduly critical.

With the SEA being fundamentally flawed, this document which underpins the whole plan needs to be undertaken afresh or the plan runs the risk of judicial review.

In support of this objection please find attached a report and 3 drawings 1078 PL1, 1078PL2 and 1078PL3 prepared by Richard Payne, Chartered Landscape Architect which forms part of this objection.

Continue overleaf if necessary

#### 5. Please give details of any suggested modifications in the box below.

SEA to be undertaken again to properly take into account statutory consultee/competent expert responses and also to ensure consistency in assessment process.

The Neighbourhood Plan runs the risk of judicial review if the SEA is not re-undertaken.

Continue overleaf if necessary

6. Do you wish to be notified of the District Council's decision to make or refuse to make the neighbourhood plan? *Please tick one box only.* 

Х	Yes
	No

Signature:

Date: 7<sup>th</sup> June 2018

If submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.

Please use this box to continue your responses to Questions 4 & 5 if necessary