

Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement - Part 2

Prepared by the Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee
on behalf of Shaftesbury Town Council - January 2020

7f. Regulation 14 database

	Policy number	Number of comments	Comment not understood	Covered elsewhere	Issues to consider	Largely covered by policy	Not possible to address via the NP	Supportive comment
Town Centre	1	27	0	10	3	7	5	2
Town Centre	2	14	0	6	3	2	2	1
Town Centre	3	13	0	7	1	3	1	1
Town Centre	4	30	0	7	7	5	6	5
Town centre total		84	0	30	14	17	14	9
Housing Employment	1	28	0	6	13	3	4	2
Housing Employment	2	21	1	3	6	6	2	3
Housing Employment	3	23	0	2	12	3	2	4
Housing Employment	4	16	1	1	4	0	8	2
Housing Employment total		88	2	12	35	12	16	11
Green Infastructure	1	32	0	10	16	0	2	4
Green Infastructure	2	27	0	3	12	0	5	7
Green Infastructure	3	25	0	4	4	9	2	6
Green Infastructure	4	13	0	0	5	0	2	6
Green Infastructure total		97	0	17	37	9	11	23
Design Heritage	1 to 7	70	1	10	41	9	3	6
Design Heritage	8	8	1	0	3	2	1	1
Design Heritage	9	5	0	0	2	3	0	0
Design Heritage total		83	2	10	46	14	4	7
Community Leisure	1	23	1	0	15	4	3	0
Community Leisure	2	17	1	8	2	5	1	0
Community Leisure	3	27	2	5	9	1	2	8
Community Leisure total		67	4	13	26	10	6	8
Generic whole plan feedback		24	0	1	16	0	1	6
Total number of comments		443	8	83	174	62	52	64

	Comments (summarised where necessary)	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft document/ actions required	Additional Information	Plan updated Yes or No
Consultation	The Draft Plan and Questionnaire documents are well produced and the website very helpful.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
General	Natural England support the policies on protecting green space and enhancing a green infrastructure network with opportunities for wildlife and other multiple benefits. We welcome the recognition of the connection between healthy living and access to nature and valued landscapes, and people's enjoyment of them, both for physical and mental well-being. This applies across age groups.	Natural England	Supportive comment					N/A
General	I can confirm that while there are no specific issues upon which we wish to comment we would like to take this opportunity to congratulate your community on its achievement, and particularly in the Plan's coverage of heritage issues in the area. It is always pleasing to note when a community values its locally distinctive historic environment, seeks to define what makes it special, and to protect and enhance this through tailored policies and proposals. The production of detailed character zones for example, to help articulate local character and as evidence base to inform the formulation and application of associated policy, is in this respect a commendable example of the Plan's content.	Historic England	Supportive comment					N/A
General	We fully support the Draft Neighbourhood plan. We endorse the policies it includes concerning local facilities for leisure and the environment together with housing, employment and commerce.	Shaftesbury Rotary	Supportive comment					N/A
General	Looks good and a super, relaxed, presentation style.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Supportive comment					N/A
General	It is clear that much good work has been done in putting the plan together and our thanks go to all those involved. We applaud the efforts to keep Shaftesbury individual and to maintain our heritage whilst looking forward to a greener existence.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
General	Query - I have been told that the area of ground by the dentist 'New Road' is not safe for building purposes, but how about extra parking?	1	Covered elsewhere	Whilst the NP has not make any specific site allocations the provision of further car parks for the town is supported under SFTC4				N/A
General	I find many of the policies to be written in a verbose and nebulous manner, that I really cannot see how and when they can be applied as effective planning policy to protect Shaftesbury against Developers.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Issue to consider	The wording has sought to achieve a reasonable balance between clarity, flexibility (where appropriate) and plain English		No further action required		No
Introduction	The Introduction (or appendices) needs to: put neighbourhood planning into its statutory context, i.e. the Localism Act 2011, the plan-making process and stages, the eight people on the neighbourhood plan advisory committee and how and why they were selected, the planning authority involved.	1	Issue to consider	The working group is mentioned briefly in the foreword but it is not considered that there needs to be additional detail in the plan.		No further action required		No
Introduction	The phrases “guidelines”, “guide” and “blueprint” perhaps underplay the status of a ‘made’ neighbourhood plan, which becomes part of the statutory development plan (see NPPF para 2 and footnote 2). Sentences along the lines of “The policies in this document could be used when planners assess applications...” suggests that the ‘planners’ have an option. This is misleading. When the plan becomes part of the development plan, the policies must be used (again see NPPF para 2).	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	The plan has been drafted to be an easy read and reflective of the situation that there can be material considerations that over-ride the development plan.		No further action required		No
General	The Town Council, District Council are not fit for purpose, they are destroying Shaftesbury	1	Not possible to address through NP	It is developers / landowners who put forward plans. However having a NP should ensure future decisions on such planning applications reflect local resident's concerns more effectively.				No
Introduction - Vision	A vision statement should express an aspiration rather than state a questionable fact, i.e. 'Shaftesbury is the best example etc..' is clearly an opinion and not a fact. It should therefore be reworded: 'Shaftesbury aims or aspires or intends to be the best example etc..' There's also no indication of where the vision statement came from and when, i.e. '- Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee, March 2018 (or whenever decided).' / what defines/determines 'best'? Any NP could say this - shouldn't vision describe a possible/desirable set of futures - hierarchy of elements e.g. identity, cohesiveness, coherent place, responsiveness, vibrancy etc... health concept-environment, social economic criteria (additional suggestions made).	2	Issue to consider	Having reviewed other plan's vision statements the one proposed for Shaftesbury is considered appropriate, and does not need to be sourced given that the referendum will provide its endorsement (if the majority of those voting vote 'yes')		No further action required		No
General	I sense the NP group have referred to the AONB Management Plan even though it does not appear in the list of evidence documents.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider			Amended > evidence sources		Yes

	Comments (summarised where necessary)	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft document/ actions required	Additional Information	Plan updated Yes or No
General	P 17 'distinct' is not right (means separate/different) - should it be 'distinctive' which implies particularity? The word 'distinct' appears elsewhere – may need altering.	Tree Group + 1	Issue to consider	Check grammar		Amended		Yes
Cover	Cover Artwork - appropriateness? Difficult for some to discern, important to clearly reflect content, implies artiness rather than conciseness and correctness.	1	Issue to consider		<i>Consider crediting cover artwork more clearly</i>	Artwork and design credits instered in to inside front cover		Yes
Introduction	Support community and private scheme to provide energy to the town by renewable energy sources such as by wind, sun and anaerobic digestion.	1	Issue to consider	This is already covered under the Local Plan policies.	Include project to investigate potential for such land uses around the town.	Develop project and recommendation to STC	<i>The following is taken from the cse booklet:</i> Explore the feasibility of setting up a Shaftesbury community renewable energy project. This could be in the form of cooperative, to identify a suitable scheme (or schemes), develop the project and raise funds through running share offers within the locality. NEW PROJECT GI 5	Yes
Introduction	Include a bit more on the landscape context of Shaftesbury in the introductory section, not just relating to the AONB but also the hilltop location, the relationship to the Blackmore Vale and the northern section of it [known in some planning circles as the Vale of Gillingham], the Chalk downlands, and the greensand ridge to the east. The extent of the AONB is rather understated. It is to the north, east, and south of the town. Similarly the role of Shaftesbury as a service centre for the AONB doesn't appear to have much profile. / Include information on the town context and setting in the wider landscape, exceptional characteristics of town, topography, geology, drainage, urban/settlement form sequence i.e. how the town has evolved in relation to the land/topography and a 'sense of place' established.	Cranborne Chase AONB + 1	Issue to consider	Agree	Include additional text reflecting the rolling vales landscape character description	Amend section 1.8 at end of para starting "Open and wooded areas" add "The nationally important landscape of the Cranborne Chase AONB wraps around the north, east, and south sides of the town, which has recently achieved international acclaim for its dark night skies." Correct last sentence of second para on 4.1 to refer to "which wraps around the north, east, and south sides of our town". Add new fourth para: "Key characteristics of the wider countryside, as described in the Dorset Landscape Character Assessment, relate to its diverse pattern of trees, woodland, hedgerow and small-scale fields, watercourses and narrow lanes, and the generally rural and tranquil nature of the area."	Updated	Yes
Introduction	Refer to adjacent areas and summarise their NPs and how they interact with Shaftesbury's NP.	1	Issue to consider	Agree	Refer to NP work being progressed in adjoining parishes.	Add final paragraph "The adjoining parish of Motcombe has a Neighbourhood Plan (2019) , and Melbury Abbas and Cann are preparing their own plan. Strategic issues will be covered in the Dorset-wide Local Plan"	Updated	Yes
Introduction	Ref section 1.6, page 10 - check population and age structure figures - although they are similar to figures that ONS provide (and Dorset Statistics website (https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/data-and-insight-for-dorset)), they are different.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	To be checked		Needs to be checked against ONS (figs taken from NDDC sports assessment	Based on Dorset statistics and predicted growth using housing trajectory. The statistics only shows 0-15 and 15-64 and 65+. Take out ND stats? Show population stats under new tab = comparison to the whole of Dorset? Review 18th November. Amended	Yes
Introduction	The 'decision makers' includes planning officers, members of planning committee, planning inspectors, and even the Secretary of State. 'Planners' can easily be interpreted as just the planning officers at the Council who although make the majority of planning decisions are not the only ones who can do so.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agreed	Amend text to clarify	Page 6 2nd column last paragraph - amend. Page 7 references planners - wider context needed	Updated	Yes
Introduction	The sentence "The government does not allow Neighbourhood Plans to block development", is not wholly correct - NPs should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies. But it can (for example) block development on small areas of land deemed important to the local community through LGS designation.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Noted	Amend text to clarify - consider using 'reduce the amount planned'	Page 7 - paragraph 5 and sentence 4:	Updated	Yes

	Comments (summarised where necessary)	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft document/ actions required	Additional Information	Plan updated Yes or No
Climate Change	There does not appear to be an overriding policy to address the present global emergency. Suggest something like, "all new development must be designed and constructed to minimise the use of fossil fuels, e.g. by building orientation, built in solar / photo electric panels, natural ventilation and high quality insulation. / Missing Policy on Climate Emergency. Both Dorset and STC have made statements acknowledging Climate Emergency and yet, even though there has been evidence gathered in Jan 2015 supporting of 70% supporting Renewable Energy, there has no policies written. This omission was brought to the attention of NHP committee members at an SOSG meeting in Jan 2019 and suggested policies were sent through for consideration. Proposed Intention:- To accord with National Policy guidelines in relation to the effect of an new development on global warming. Proposed Policy. All new developments within Shaftesbury shall seek to achieve a high standards of sustainability and in particular demonstrate in proposals how design, construction has sought to 1. reduce the use of fossil fuels; 2. promote the efficient use of natural resources, 3. re-use and recycling of resources and the production of consumable of renewable energy 4. Adopt best practice in sustainable urban drainage. / Include a new over-arching stand alone policy specifically on climate change. The justification for this is manifold (various reasons given, including declarations of the climate emergency and need to act now, and that the Local Plan adopted policies do not require such [sustainable energy] provisions). Of the examples on p15 of the draft some have little or no relevance to climate change or the magnitude and urgency of the situation and others are tenuous and feeble and need considerable beefing up or amendment. Suggest using wording along the following lines: This Plan requires all development in the town of whatever sort or scale to conform with immediate effect, i.e. from 2020, to the most radical and stringent standards of sustainability to ensure development in the town contributes the maximum to the drive to prevent the average global temperature rising any further, i.e. beyond 1.5 degrees. The Plan therefore requires:	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group + 3	Issue to consider	The potential for a climate change policy has been considered but as can be seen the issues impact on so many areas that the approach taken to include it in the introduction and signpost to the relevant policies was considered the best way to tackle the issue (NB the detailed comments are also considered under the relevant policy areas)	Review introductory text and reinforce the messages of the importance of the policy elements as appropriate	Additional strength of messages being included within Climate Change - under review. RB amd LH rewriting the CC section.	The idea of a climate change policy had been considered in drafting the plan – but climate change touches on so many different areas, that a single policy was not considered practical. The decision was therefore taken to include climate change in the introduction and show how the plan was addressing the issues and challenges throughout its policies. We have taken this opportunity to look again at the policies and wherever possible reinforce the importance of addressing climate change – however it is clear from the Bridport NP Examiner’s report that setting requirements that go beyond existing Government standards is not possible. Updates have also been made to the introduction to reinforce some of the key messages and to reflect the changes to the plan	Yes
Climate Change	Section 1.10 could be much stronger. The bullet points should also highlight any new projects linked to climate change - for example, committing the council to work pro-actively in the community to a) encourage allotment gardening and community growing projects and the production, consumption and sale of locally sourced food b) encourage the use and development of renewable energy sources c) encourage steps to reduce energy use in homes, businesses and elsewhere d) encourage more sustainable transport, as well as walking and cycling These projects could be described in a new appendix.	1	Issue to consider	See above	See above	see above	As above	Yes

SFTC 1	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft document/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
No proper consideration for land East of Christy's Lane		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFCL1 (and Project CL1)				N/A
But I am concerned about parking and cars in the Town Centre. Cars still seem to have priority over pedestrians- we need better signage so it's safer to cross the high street.		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFTC4				N/A
Limited scope. No mention of the abundant street furniture and A-boards etc which are difficult to navigate through, are confusing and detract from the high street aesthetics. No mention of how to assist the growing numbers of wheelchair, zimmer and pushchair users in the town - the uneven pavements		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFDH4				N/A
Agree, but with the provision that active measures to reduce the use of cars in the town centre are taken e.g. TISBUS		1 Covered elsewhere	Project TC4				N/A
Yes and also feel keeping these tourism numbers up, and increasing is key to the town centre and shows the real importance of maintaining it to attract even more "new" tourists.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Also cycle racks		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFDH5 deals with cycle racks in relation to new development				N/A
What is the problem with asphalt? It s all weather, wheelchair and buggy friendly - Would anyone prefer to walk or push a wheelchair on mud on cobbles ?	Shaftesbury Transport Forum	Covered elsewhere	Supporting text on pg 65 states "Surfacing materials are also important. Whilst in historic quarters traditional materials should be considered, the surfacing needs to be				N/A
The public transport summary is incorrect – the author has missed out the Blandford service, given a one day a week market bus a mention- and not mentioned frequencies I ve updated it as I think it should be on separate sheet	Shaftesbury Transport Forum	Issue to consider	Plan checked and no such references found.			This information is in the Parking study that was conducted in November 2018. The bus route has	N/A
Equal consideration given to quality of building and the public realm, the labyrinth - like network of spaces between and around buildings that shape of perception and experience of a place. Hard surfacing, edging, artefacts, signs, motifs, icons, etc.		1 Covered elsewhere	This is covered in the design and character policies (SFDH)				N/A
Post it- Can we try cheaper rents in empty shops like Frome.		1 Covered elsewhere	Project TC1				N/A
Street markets really important.	Tree Group + 1	Supportive comment					N/A
The town has been over developed already with no regard to the people who have lived in Shaftesbury all there life!		1 Not possible to address through NP					No
But could the old co op site become a permanent market with stalls selling food, bric a brac etc?		1 Largely covered by the policy	"They maintain a strong and vibrant retail presence within the town centre area"				No
No mention of how to tackle unsightly empty buildings etc that are highly visible in the high street and parking areas		1 Not possible to address through NP	Project TC4 - pop up shop project deals with encouraging active use when properties become empty.				No
A food store on the Bell street is crucial to the future vitality of the town centre, without it people will do all of their shopping in the Coppice street and Christ's Lane stores, and not be bothered to walk into town. Footfall is down 16% since it closed, also elderly from the western end of town find it easier to		2 Largely covered by the policy	"They maintain a strong and vibrant retail presence within the town centre area"				No
Only need a small shop at the Co-op site.		1 Largely covered by the policy	"They maintain a strong and vibrant retail presence within the town centre area"				No
Too much corruption between STC/DC and property developers		1 Not possible to address through NP					No
I would like to add that the 'varied range on independent shops' includes basic needs of residents e.g. Butchers, bakers, green grocers, general store, newsagent, NOT just for tourists.		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy says "They maintain a strong and vibrant retail presence within the town centre area"				No
Parking appraisal- Not sure if proposal to reduce maximum length of stay will be popular - we would end up like Gillingham or Warminster where 90min/2 hour Max parking is the norm but where there is little tourist trade. Variable Message parking availability signs are a good idea.	Shaftesbury Transport Forum	Largely covered by the policy	The policy (and related project) does not prescribe the details of how parking will be better managed, leaving the details of this to be determined outside of the				No
Suitability of Angola 76 in its location? - noise and disturbance. Appearance (gateway) in conservation area. Has it PP/licences in place?		1 Not possible to address through NP	This is a detailed matter - whether pp existing is a matter for enforcement				No
IDENTIFY POOR EXAMPLES. Superdrug - building and street level frontage appearance. Others - why?		1 Covered elsewhere	This issue is covered in Policy SCTC3				No
Post it - badly need a roundabout outside the Post Office		1 Not possible to address through NP					No
No mention of how to give a better first impression to visitors/coach parties.		1 Covered elsewhere	Project GI3 deals with planting	Include strategic tree planting project (linked to Project GI3) within the town centre car parking	Reference within town tree plan - update recommendation to STC. Comment in GI3 project	Update GI3 project to reference "Undertake audit of tree coverage and produce strategic tree plan for	Yes
The criteria listed in the policy all have the potential to improve the town centre, and therefore have our support. However, given the diverse nature of the criteria, few schemes are likely to meet more than one of the criteria. Therefore, it might be clearer to amend the policy to say: "Development proposals within	Dorset Council	Issue to consider		Yes - revise text to address this point	Wording revised		Yes

SFTC 1	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft document/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
With the exception of pubs which we have enough of already, struggling.	1	Covered elsewhere	Whilst this policy does not specifically resist the loss of pubs, these are protected under Policy SFCL2 as a key tourist-related facility	Pubs are important facilities for both visitors and local residents. Clarify the protection to pubs	Check cross link. Added pubs into SFCL2 on page 78 and cross reference to map in Policy at end	CL 2 Updated	Yes
Pedestrianisation of some of the town centre is needed / Post it- can we have more no traffic days in the centre like market days / This doesn't go far enough with respect to 'pedestrian-friendly' public spaces or for that matter 'bicycle-friendly' spaces. I believe Shaftesbury would be better served by making the Lidl site does not have planning approval at this time. Omit 'store' etc and 'site' etc add - possible future commercial development or significant strategic site/car parl (including) omit green area on Lidl green site.	Shaftesbury Civic Society + 6	Largely covered in the policy	Policy includes "create a safe and pedestrian friendly public spaces" - the wholesale pedestrianisation of the town centre is not likely to be feasible and outside the	Consider additional text to explain complexity of pedestrianisation, and include project to explore	Additional project TC5 on page 86 "A project is proposed to look at the potential of pedestrianising or	Updated	Yes
	1	Issue to consider	Noted	Revise map to revise 'site under construction' to 'site acquired for redevelopment'.	Wording amended		Yes
The Chamber would not support any external retail development on the land south of the A30, or any out-of-town retail development that could adversely affect the success of town centre shops and businesses.	Shaftesbury Chamber of Commerce	Largely covered by the policy	Clarify that any retail development outside of this area, that could adversely affect the success of town centre shops and businesses, will not be supported.		Additional point within policy on page 19 .	Amended	Yes

SFTC 2	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Very urgent consideration needs to be given to the range of shops - far too many coffee shops	1	Issue to consider	Whilst it may be possible to control change of use into A3 (restaurant / café), there is no obvious justification for this given that the latest data shows leisure uses recorded at 14% of units, which is well below the national average (24%) and nearby Gillingham (18%)		No further action required		No
Very urgent consideration needs to the implementation of a 1 way system to avoid the usual havoc on the High Street	1	Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP				No
Large central properties like the Old Somerfield's shouldn't be allowed to lie vacant for years - we need a leisure centre.	1	Largely covered by the policy	The policy provides flexibility for such a change				No
I DO THINK THAT MODERN REALLY GOOD DESIGN SHOULD ALWAYS BE GIVEN CONSIDERATION AS NO TOWN, SHOULD BECOME STATIC AND UNPREPARED TO TAKE ON ILLUMINATING AND INTERESTING CHANGES OUT OF HAND	1	Covered elsewhere	This is covered in the design and character policies (SFDH)				N/A
But attention should be paid to virtual non- existence of accommodation above commercial premises. Walk along at night to see how empty it is. This kills the soul of centre and is scandalous waste of space Grants needed for installation of separate access.	1	Covered elsewhere	See Policy SFTC1 - grants are outside the scope of this NP				N/A
Doesn't mention how to bring more of a flavour of its rural setting into the high street - how ethical/environmentally encouraging permanent spots of oasis could improve the vitality of the town centre.	1	Covered elsewhere	See policy SFDH4 - however soft landscaping is not a key characteristic of the area (see 5.2.2)				N/A
Doesn't mention how more festivals etc can integrate better with existing businesses.	1	Not possible to address through NP	Temporary use of land for festivals is largely outside the scope of a NP				No
Doesn't consider needs of immediate residences in the area - noise etc.	1	Covered elsewhere	The Local Plan includes specific policies on amenity that would address issues of noise etc in any planning application				No
Retail frontage should extend into Bleke Street as far as the Ship.	1	Issue to consider	This area was not identified in the retail study - and is a mix of residential, public house and some limited shop fronts, and therefore does contain a concentration of shop fronts. Excluding it provides some greater flexibility should the demand for town centre uses shrink.		No further action required		No
However the Hovis loaf is an eyesore and should be removed.	1	Covered elsewhere	Project TC3 - Tidying and decluttering				N/A
Mostly. Having some office mixed in with the shops may be beneficial in keeping the area 'alive' rather than a row of empty shops due to the rise in internet shopping. Local independent shops would be ideal.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
But A2 uses must be subservient to retail and community uses / Financial and professional services (A2) should be discouraged from street frontage – plenty of room behind and upstairs.	Tree Group + 2	Largely covered by the policy	The latest data shows such uses recorded at 18% of units, which is above the national average (10%) and but less than nearby Gillingham (21%). Retail accounts for nearly half of the units (48%). A2 uses do require customer access (unlike B1), and the policy states "provided that A2 uses do not become the predominant use in that stretch of shop frontage"				No
Suggest any additional A5 uses (hot food takeaway) on the narrower parts of the High St should be avoided	1	Issue to consider	Presumably this is due to concerns regarding parking - this is particularly an issue for deliveries and customer access in the Narrows	Consider expanding Policy STFC2 to make specific reference to clearly identifying how provision for deliveries and customer collections will be met for any change of use within the section identified as the Narrows	Update map to show The Narrows. New supporting text: Within the section known as the Narrows, the restricted width causes major difficulties when cars and lorries stop to make deliveries and collections. As such, the intensification of A5 uses would be a particular issue for this section of the High Street. A possible solution may be the inclusion of a Traffic Regulation Order to restrict all parking, loading and unloading ("blips") and this will be investigated. Amend third bullet point to add "with the exception of A5 uses within the section shown as The Narrows".	Map and text updated.	Yes
It is starting to look like any town for historical character	1	Covered elsewhere	This is covered in the design and character policies (SFDH)				N/A

SFTC 3	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Local people struggle to get jobs around here and this is due to more houses being built in Shaftesbury and jobs being given to residents that have only lived here for five minutes!!	1	Covered elsewhere	Policy SFHE1				N/A
Ban cars from centre / have you considered pedestrianisation of the high street to give a more pleasant shopping experience	2	Covered elsewhere	see earlier comments under SFTC1 re pedestrianisation				N/A
I do but have reservations - all outlined in previous comment sections. Also, rather than preserve in aspic - when you talk about 'historic' what part of history? a mish-mash of medieval/Edwardian/Victorian/1960s? which age are you considering or will it be similar to 'mock Tudor'?	2	Covered elsewhere	This is covered in the design and character policies (SFDH)				N/A
Please do not let Lidl build a wrinkly tin house. The Tesco building fits in well and so should Lidl / Proposed Lidl building should be in keeping, as Tesco had to comply, not the usual style.	2	Covered elsewhere	This is covered in the design and character policies (SFDH)				N/A
Aiming high in design terms always pays off – bravo to policies on good and consistent signage, lighting, bins, benches, fascia's, painted wood, energy efficiency, maintenance of the external integrity of smaller shop fronts and small unit availability. Move away from plastic fascia's welcome bring back local sign painters. High quality hanging signs could become a hallmark of the High Street.	Tree Group + 1	Supportive comment					N/A
I would like to think that Shaftesbury is not just preserved in aspic but could embrace really high quality contemporary design to show current and future inhabitants that we are a 'living' town.	1	Covered elsewhere	This is covered in the design and character policies (SFDH)				N/A
Broadly agree, but see no point in redevelopment of late C20th/C21st buildings merely for sake of enhancing character. Buildings should only be redeveloped when unfit for purpose. Otherwise we are wasting resources, some of which (e.g. sand) it is becoming clear are finite.	1	Largely covered by the policy	The policy would only come into effect when redevelopment is proposed - a change of use would be possible without redevelopment under SFTC2				No
Should state that internally illuminated signs are prohibited.	1	Largely covered by the policy	The policy states that "Shop front signage should preserve and enhance the historic character of the shopfront" - this would apply to internally illuminated signs				No
Too late	1	Not possible to address through NP					No
More signage including where cycle routes and paths connect	1	Covered elsewhere	Project CL3 and CL4				N/A
Single glazed windows should be replaced whenever possible, however UPVC/plastic should be avoided	1	Largely covered by the policy	The policy states that "alternative glazing options to single-glazed units may be considered due to the greater energy efficiency (and better visibility for internal displays)."				No
pg 22. *par 2* Why not? Look at Superdrug again. Add hard surfaces, robust, consistent - (vs current mixture hotch-potch) should be in design statement.	1	Covered elsewhere	Policy SFDH4 and other design policies				N/A
Section 2.5 is about preserving and enhancing the historic town centre, it might be worth pointing out here that the town centre is largely covered by a conservation area and also includes a large proportion of listed buildings, meaning that the area already has a level of protection.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Relevant to SFTC3	Insert new para at the start of the supporting text to STFC3 to read: "The historic buildings and character of the town centre already have a high degree of protection because of the large proportion of Listed buildings and because much of the area is also part of the Shaftesbury Conservation Area (since 1970). The Dorset Historic Towns Survey of Shaftesbury (2011) usefully describes the town's historical development and how this has shaped its character."	Text updated		Yes

SFTC 4	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Less houses being built on our beautiful countryside would mean less parking is required why spoil a beautiful town but putting social housing everywhere!!		1 Not possible to address through NP	The housing target for Shaftesbury is set through the Local Plan and is not something that the NP can reduce				No
This would help make the high street pedestrian friendly		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Car flow needs to be reduced in the High Street, people don't shop where they have to share with traffic / Have we considered impact of pedestrianizing High street between Muston's Lane and The commons to give a much more pleasant environment. Would need to be restricted hours, say 1000-1600 to allow deliveries to be made. Downside is we would lose 24 parking spaces and public transport access but the shopping experience isn't too pleasant with narrow pavements and excess vehicles / Ban cars or implement a 1 way system / Ideally I would like High Street part pedestrianised / Reasonable attempts to reduce traffic on the high street and consider pedestrianising are needed to help improve the enjoyment of the high street	Shaftesbury Civic Society + 4	Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP	The potential of pedestrianising or reducing traffic in the town centre has been raised throughout - but has not been promoted by local retailers, may not be practical and could create unintentional traffic problems on the lanes. These issues may best be explored through a project.	Additional project TC5 on page 86 "A project is proposed to look at the potential of pedestrianising or reducing traffic in the town centre. This will need to consider practicalities; cost feasibility; impact on deliveries, footfall and retailers.	Updated	Yes
But Tesco is private regulation of 2 hrs is wrong. It used to be 3 hours daily / Need to look at parking length of time		2 Covered elsewhere	Project TC4				N/A
But consider push chairs, walking frames, wheelchairs too and safe paving materials and safe road crossings for pedestrians.		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy STFC1 and SFDH4				N/A
You need to make sure that parking provisions are made with all planning decisions both business and residential		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy deals with anu use that would increase parking requirements				No
Please get a cycle lane built to link Shaftesbury and Gillingham and improve the frequency of buses between these 2 towns.		1 Not possible to address through NP	This goes beyond the NP area and what it can influence.				No
I would really like to see consideration of a 'park and ride' type plan / one way systems etc and a tougher stance taken on parking (with or without a blue badge) that causes congestion and potential dangers to other motorists and pedestrians.		1 Covered elsewhere	Project TC4				N/A
Despite the discussion of climate change earlier on in the document, this policy appears to be equivocal in its support for electric vehicle charging points by adding the qualifier "...provided there is demonstrable demand." ... I would suggest removing this qualifier. / I suggest that in view of heightened concern about climate breakdown and the commitment for UK to be net-zero carbon emissions by 2050 the provision of vehicle charging points should be expected without the need to demonstrate demand. Some visitors requiring charging points won't come if the charging points are not there and provision may encourage take up of the electric vehicles that will reduce pollution and carbon emissions in the town. / Electric emission charging points should be installed before waiting for a demonstrable demand. People won't buy electric cars if there are no charging points in the town. Local filling stations and supermarkets should be strongly encouraged to provide charging points. There should be a focus on reducing the number of journeys made by petrol/diesel cars within Shaftesbury. / Need electric car charging points ASAP	Dorset Council + 3	Issue to consider	Note that the Government are currently funding such initiatives and have also recently launched a consultation with respect to requiring provision in new buildings	Agreed that the policy reads too restrictive and that this is to be encouraged.	Delete "provided there is demonstrable demand" and add new para to supporting text "It is also important to ensure provision is made for electric / ultra-low emission vehicle charging points, and there is government funding available to help with this."		Yes
A greater emphasis is to be placed upon enforcement of parking on double yellow lines in evening and at night.		1 Covered elsewhere	Project TC4				N/A
Please give consideration to disabled drivers.		1 Largely covered by the policy	This would be considered under the policy and also TC4				
Proposals that increase the level of level of parking provision contradict policies relating to climate change (1.10) to reduce carbon emissions (and air pollution) by relying too much on the car. They could be supported only if they offer electric top up points. There will never be enough car parking places. Much depends on where they can go and what they replace. Any additions must have trees for shade and hedges to reduce spread of pollution. / No more parking / Contradicts proposals relating to climate change (1.10) to reduce carbon emissions. There will never be enough parking places. Where will new car parks go and what will they replace? New car parks need trees and hedges for shade and to reduce pollution / Environmentally friendly transport, more public transport etc should take precedence over planning for cars / Worth bearing in mind that lack of parking is an incentive for not bringing cars into the town - maybe emphasis should be on better public transport etc. / There's an inconsistency between 'creating a safe and pedestrian-friendly public space' and creating more town centre parking spaces. The two don't tally.	Tree Group + 5	Issue to consider	Parking problems were a key concern raised through the consultations, and there are projects to promote alternatives. Reducing spaces could equally result in more people driving greater distances to shop (rather than use other modes of transport)		No further action required		No
Yes to electric vehicle points / We need to be offering electric charging, cycling etc.		2 Supportive comment					
Re. Shuttle bus - Transport action group should be dealing with this one. We have tried it before, with a smartly liveried dedicated town circular bus running frequently with a flat fare of 20p. These schemes in other small towns fall by the wayside quickly. In my view, the already frequent Shaftesbury/Gillingham service should incorporate the estates, offering not only health centre/ town centre opportunities, but also connectivity with trains. It would require an extra vehicle and driver. / Shuttle bus idea sound- low floor 16 seat bus linking suburbs east of A350 with Town Centres and Health Centre, but who provides funding? Lidl; have funded the Blandford service.		2 Covered elsewhere	Project TC4	Mention TAG under the project	Update to STC re project and wotk in collaboration with the Transport Forum		Yes
Raise the profile of how the town centre is managed. Closer links with planning. Carparking to be enhanced and to increase dwell time	Shaftesbury Civic Society	Covered elsewhere	Project TC4				N/A
However there needs to be plenty of parking for tourists		1 Supportive comment					N/A
One way of mitigating car park congestion might be to encourage a late shopping night each week This would also help working people who live here to build a relationship with the centre of their own town.	Tree Group + 1	Not possible to address through NP		Pass this comment to Chamber of Commerce to consider	Actioned. Chair of Chamber advised on 4/12		No

SFTC 4	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
It would be good if a Park and Ride scheme were considered with in this. Where? Perhaps a carpark underneath the Solar panels in the field on the edge of Shaftesbury beside the A350. / what about a park and ride scheme		2 Largely covered by the policy	The policy would not preclude this, but it is unlikely that there would be public resources to fund such a scheme in the foreseeable future.				No
When it states "Developer contributions may be required to facilitate the provision of additional off-street parking..." – under what circumstances? Policies need to provide a level of certainty to applicants and decision makers.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Planning obligations can only be required when reasonable and necessary to allow the planning permission. An increase in parking need or loss of spaces could give rise to harm that could be avoided through measures secured via a S106 agreement.	Amend policy by addition of "if without such measures the proposed development would increase parking pressures and cause an unacceptable level of harm." and clarify that it applies to the Town Centre area only	Policy amended		Yes
Should work if allowed to by other authorities		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Strongly recommend 20 MPH speed limit on all approaches to the town for the major roundabouts as well as the entrances like St James, Enmore Green etc...		1 Not possible to address through NP	Studies have been undertaken and very few areas would qualify for such provisions. Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP				No
The parking study makes several assumptions which make the whole thing questionable. Please see attached comments re. parking traffic flow. Shaftesbury does not have congestion, just bad drivers.		1 Issue to consider	Parking problems was one of the main issues raised through the consultations, and the study was undertaken by an independent consultant with expertise in this subject.		No further action required		No
In addition to pay regard to environmental issues e.g. electric cars. Increased bus/coach parking		1 Largely covered by the policy	Whilst this was not identified as a specific issue in the evidence, it is not precluded by the policy.				No
In addition to supporting the policies highlighted in this response, the Chamber of Commerce would like to emphasise its considerable concern about the parking situation in and around the Town Centre; the Chamber welcomes the findings of the commissioned parking survey and urges all parties involved in future planning for Shaftesbury to put parking at the very heart of all decisions.	Shaftesbury Chamber of Commerce	Supportive comment					N/A
With a view to providing more parking spaces in Shaftesbury Town Centre we would suggest that the highways authority is asked to look at increasing roadside parking. We believe that there is the possibility of increasing spaces along Bell Street by adding to the existing spaces marked out as such as those outside the library/nursery. Also on Salisbury Street it would be better if people parked in a slightly extended marked space that on the double yellow lines. Worst offenders here are users of the laundrette who have no qualms about parking halfway between the two legal parking areas and are causing traffic to back up, sometimes in both directions during the working day. To ease the flow of traffic in the town centre those who ignore the double yellow lines should be penalised. It should be the norm for these people to be challenged. It should also be pointed out to disabled drivers that they should at least make an effort to park so as not to obstruct the highway. Parking as near to the marked bays as possible would reduce the obstruction to buses/delivery vehicles in particular.		1 Covered elsewhere	Project TC4				N/A
In connection with 'charging points' you may wish to consider a rider along the lines of 'where this does not conflict with Listed Buildings, the settings of them, Conservation Area and historic environment matters.'	Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider	This is in part covered under Policy SFDH6, but perhaps the need for sensitive design could be made clear in the supporting text.	Include reference in the supporting text to respecting the character of the area.	Update text to reference avoid harm to heritage assets and the root protection areas of protected trees.		Yes
Require all public parking areas are provided with a minimum of two rapid-charge EV charging points [as Lidl says it will]		1 Largely covered by the policy	There is no evidence to base a more prescriptive requirement on				No
Ensure all vehicles powered only by fossil fuels (petrol or diesel) are actively prevented from entering the town centre or actively discouraged if prevention is not possible.		1 Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP				No
Introduce an electric shuttle bus service for all residents within the town boundary (Amend project TC4) / Buses need to be electrified and smaller with more varied routes and collection zones. The Tisbus offers the beginnings of a good example.		2 Issue to consider	Could be included as advisory	Insert "(electric/ultra-low emission)"	Update text to policy and project		Yes
Introduce a 'Boris bikes' scheme to promote cycling as an alternative to driving within the town boundary.		1 Issue to consider	This may feature as a future project once the cycle routes are improved.		No further action required at this stage. Will be added to SFTC6 as a consideration for project in the future		Yes

SFHE1	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
This suggestion of a ‘quota’ of 1,245 dwellings is misleading. The Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) Policy 6 states ‘at least’ 1,140 dwellings for Shaftesbury.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agreed - the 1245 relates more directly to the Housing Trajectory	Amend to ‘at least’ 1,140 dwellings for Shaftesbury.	Amended on page 25		Yes
Say that the ‘District’ cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply rather than the ‘Council’. This is partly because North Dorset District Council no longer exists, but the former North Dorset District does exist for planning purposes, including for calculating the 5-year housing land supply.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Pg25 refers to LPA	Amend to Local Planning Authority	Replaced with Local Planning Authority		Yes
Page 27 - the word “also” in the second sentence of the second paragraph appears to be a mistake. Land in Wiltshire or in Motcombe, etc. is outside Shaftesbury Parish so ‘also’ is not needed.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agreed	Delete 'also'	Amended		Yes
Page 27 - second paragraph in middle column – the Local Plan “requires” 285 homes a year (not “allocated”).	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agreed	Amend to 'requires'	Amended		Yes
Page 27 central column - work on the North Dorset Local Plan Review ceased several months ago, and therefore this text is out of date and misleading.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	As the decision to progress a Dorset-wide plan has now been made the 366 target (and 73 homes each year) may not longer be relevant	Amend third para to read "A new Local Plan for Dorset is being prepared which will reconsider (and could increase) the number of homes to be built in this area." Delete second sentence of fourth para. Amend final sentence of fifth para to read "On this basis, Shaftesbury already has enough housing land for the foreseeable future without releasing further greenfield sites."	Amended		Yes
If things were carefully considered they wouldn't be building a huge housing estate on a field of natural outstanding beauty! The ancient woodland behind the estate being built near Littledown is going to be ruined and destroyed by members of the public. It's such a shame as it's a untouched area of Shaftesbury! / Clearly not even currently sustainable / Too much / SUSTAINABLE. Not sustained growth - there is a huge difference.		3 Not possible to address through NP	The housing growth including that at Littledown were agreed through the Local Plan and are not something that the NP can change		No further action required		Yes
The current infrastructure in Shaftesbury is inadequate for what we have now. We need more schools and medical services to support any additional housing / Consider facilities, school capacity, doctors surgery capacity. The importance of the positive financial impact of preserving hardy's Dorset and the Blackmore vale / Make sure other services are in place when housing permission granted. / Doctors and schools need to be considered, plus traffic density. / There are not the facilities such as doctors, Schools and dentists / Schools! / Facilities, amenities, schools and medical centres need to keep pace with more housing and housing needs to be affordable		6 Largely covered by the policy	See also section 6.1 and supporting evidence base that shows our research on this				No
Good in theory, in theory in practise developers seem to walk all over local councils.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Most definitely		1 Supportive comment					N/A
The wording in this planning policy is not worded to state that building in the Countryside, outside the Settlement Boundary up to and including 2031 must be refused. Shaftesbury has met its quota of housing building as specified in the 2016 Local Plan and has now met a surplus of housing due to the fact many Shaftesbury Brownfield sites (not previously identified in the Local Plan) have been released for Housing Development. Neither the Local Planning Authority nor Shaftesbury Town Council have presented any evidence of a Shaftesbury's Housing Need Assessment. Policy 18 clearly states 1140 homes were deemed to be needed in Shaftesbury. The lack of 5 year housing supply has never been supported with a Housing Need Assessment for Shaftesbury The policy needs to state 'no further housing developments' allowed outside the Shaftesbury Settlement Boundary, the policy written in the NHP is not phrased strong enough to protect the open spaces surrounding Shaftesbury. The proposed revised intention SFHE1 should state - ...'To define and protect the Open Spaces which surround Shaftesbury in order to retain the open rural aspect of the town which is so much appreciated by the inhabitants and to enhance the Shaftesbury Green Infrastructure..'. The proposed SFHE1 policy should state:- ' Every effort shall be made to prevent any further housing development in the green spaces outside Shaftesbury's Settlement Boundary.../ Building outside settlement boundary should not be considered. / No building outside the settlement boundary should be allowed by developers/confused policy / This policy is obfuscating. Its lack of clarity and the lack of a firm policy against any development beyond the Settlement Boundary offers a loophole that fails to protect the town from opportunistic developers / This policy is not clear and confusingly written. No developments should be permitted outside the settlement boundary. This policy offers a loophole that does not protect the town from opportunistic developers. / I would hope to see a much stronger protection of the existing settlement boundary. Suggest that All development on green spaces and outside the settlement boundary should only be allowed if it can be shown that there is	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group + 6	Issue to consider	The policy does not support building outside of the settlement boundary, but the settlement boundary 'protection' is not a relevant policy when the Local Plan area does not have a 5 year housing land supply.	Agree need to provide further clarification - including changes to the policy to better reflect the housing land supply and how this impacts on the status of policies, as well as the timing and relevance of the Local Plan review.	Provide further clarification as follows: Reword SFHE1 as "No changes should be made to the settlement boundary while there remains a substantial housing supply in comparison to the adopted Local Plan requirement. In those circumstances where the Local Plan housing supply policies are not considered up-to-date, and an application for housing outside the settlement boundary is received, this should be accompanied by a clear assessment of the social, economic and environmental impacts of the development on its own and cumulatively with other planned developments, including the likely impact on the capacity of the town’s infrastructure and highway network." Amend completions table to include 69 completions for 2018/19, and adjust completions total to 768 (and reduce projected to 482). Add supporting text to follow in from the policy intention of STFC1: "There has been significant expansion of the town in recent years. As of April 2019 there were still 432 dwellings that were permitted or under construction – which exceeds the planned requirement to 2031. Having regard for the adopted Local Plan’s strategy for North Dorset, and the number of sites currently available, there is no obvious need for more housing to be included in this Neighbourhood Plan prior to the review of the Local Plan. There is no need to change the existing settlement boundaries. Furthermore, as it wouldn't make sense to build outside of the bypass corridor, and given the	Yes	

SFHE1	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Surely STC can make more robust intervention here. There should be some red lines on areas where development will be resisted and the grounds for such resistance set out in advance of planning applications being submitted.	1	Covered elsewhere	Policy SFG12				N/A
Need to ensure new developments are incorporated with the town, why not a pedestrian light controlled crossing from the Redrow development along A350 to school/bus top?	1	Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP, and planning permission for this development already granted		No further action required		No
With regards to potential new housing development, Councillors feel that the Donheads are vulnerable to any mismanagement of water drainage systems (such as the current lagoons), as the water courses flow down to the Donheads. They would like reassurance that the policies within the NHP ensure that appropriate and effective systems are in place and are regularly monitored.	Donheads Parish Council	Issue to consider	This would normally be dealt with through the drainage strategies, but this specific issues can be highlighted in the supporting text	Amend supporting text to highlight this as an example of an issue that needs to be considered (and supports the case that major decisions on housing sites outside the plan-making process are more liable to give rise to unforeseen consequences).	Add further para to end of section 'Why does this matter' to read: "The Local Plan Review process should provide an appropriate level of scrutiny to help consider and address the wider impacts of further growth, that is not easily done when individual planning applications are considered under the presumption if favour of development that happens when there is a wider housing shortfall. For example, the adjoining Donheads parishes have highlighted their vulnerability to poorly managed ware drainage systems - yet they are not consulted on planning applications in Shaftesbury unless it abuts their parish boundary."	The text has been inserted into a new paragraph below the introduction to the table section. Too much text for quick read section	Yes
The proposed revised intention SFHE1 should state - ...'To define and protect the Open Spaces which surround Shaftesbury in order to retain the open rural aspect of the town which is so much appreciated by the inhabitants and to enhance the Shaftesbury Green Infrastructure..'. The proposed SFHE1 policy should state:- ' Every effort shall be made to prevent any further housing development in the green spaces outside Shaftesbury's Settlement Boundary, which has not been allocated and defined in the 2016 NDDC LP. Every effort shall be made to ensure that these green spaces are preserved to retain the intrinsic character of Shaftesbury settlement...'...'The fields which constitute the area outside of Shaftesbury's Settlement Boundary are classified as Countryside for planning purposes. They provide Green Spaces between buildings and afford far-reaching views into the countryside and contribute significantly towards the rural character of Shaftesbury, which the community of Shaftesbury wishes to preserve. The protection of these green spaces and the wildlife corridors between them, such as hedgerows, trees, banks and verges will also contribute towards the enhancement of the Green Infrastructure within the NHP.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Largely covered by the policy	Policy SFG12				No
Page 27 SFHE1 Settlement Boundary: Move to traffic related policy "What about the traffic? We have, as part of the work, obtained data on growing levels of traffic on Christy's Lane, which continues to strengthen the need for the Eastern Bypass to be built."	Tree Group + 1	Issue to consider	This is a much reduced summary in the intro, with further detail on this later in the section				No
No information has been presented to explain where the completion/ projection figures set out in the table on page 28 have been taken from. Likewise, no reference is made in the document to the evidence base which has underpinned the 'map of development areas' shown on page 29. As such, this plan does not appear to be founded on a criteria-based assessment of land adjoining the built-up area.	PCL Planning	Covered elsewhere	See Housing and Employment background paper - the housing data has been supplied by the LPA.				No
The figures set out in the adopted Local Plan are not 'quotas' and should not be seen as an upper ceiling. Neighbourhood Plans should not look to 'block' development, rather the plan should look to ensure that any new development is appropriate to its setting and is sustainable. In our view, reviewing settlement boundaries and identifying sites for development would give greater certainty for all parties on future development, rather than relying on sites being brought forward in situations where the Council are unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. Some residents may support additional residential development, and indeed sites they may feel would be suitable for this purpose. / The NP should be systematically map and scrutinise all the potential development sites and assess them for their sustainability or otherwise	PCL Planning + 1	Issue to consider	The plan does not block development but does recognise that (1) the town has had significant recent growth and continues to have a healthy supply of land without the need to release more greenfield sites and (2) there is no general community consensus that additional growth is needed. The Dorset Local Plan is the appropriate place to determine what further strategic growth is needed, and the NP can be reviewed when this is done.				No
It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan does not reference the considerable amount of funding given to the Local Authority for Affordable Housing Contribution, where dwellings have been built with no affordable housing in Shaftesbury. Nor does not indicate the actual number of Affordable Housing and Contributions that has been built in Shaftesbury to date. Parcel 1&2 have a 80% Affordable Housing number; the rest of East of Shaftesbury has been 30%; Littledown is 30% and Barratts 15%.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group + 1	Not possible to address through NP	The available S106 finance is not relevant to the proposed policies - the majority of the S106 funding has now been allocated to the Almshouse project (as agreed in 2017)				No

SFHE1	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
It is unclear how the NHP has come up with the notion that this is insufficient for this town and that a'The use of a suitable delivery vehicle, such as a Community Land Trust (CLT) should be secured where possible to manage the allocation of affordable housing and give priority to those with a local connection in housing need....' The justification for these projects needs full investigation based on the surplus housing that has been built in Shaftesbury	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Covered elsewhere	The project would first to test the feasibility of a CLT. A CLT could deliver Affordable Housing on sites in the future and would provide the ability to introduce more local connection allocation criteria.				N/A
I think the need for truly affordable housing has been overlooked		1 Covered elsewhere	The need is covered in the supporting text and Appx B, but there was no clear public support to allow affordable housing on rural exception sites outside the town boundary, and no evidence that a higher percentage of AH would be viable within the town.				N/A
While the sentiments behind this policy are appreciated, it should be noted that planning applications already have to consider their impact on grey, social and green infrastructure in order to be compliant with LPP1 policies 13, 14, and 15. The 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' can also still apply if North Dorset fails on the Housing Delivery Test (see NPPF footnote 7). Perhaps amend the criteria so that it applies to all major residential schemes not already planned for in the development plan.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Whilst there may be a degree of overlap, the policy also highlights other matters such as the existing housing supply in Shaftesbury and likely traffic growth and cumulative impacts with other development	Agree need to provide further clarification - including changes to the policy to better reflect the housing land supply and how this impacts on the status of policies, as well as the timing and relevance of the Local Plan review.	As above - refer instead to "where the Local Plan housing supply policies are not considered up-to-date"	Check positioning of text on page 30	Yes
General comment – it would be useful if maps throughout the document could be numbered so that policies can refer to them unambiguously.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree		Include map reference numbers for all maps and include cross-reference to Map numbers within relevant policies (eg as shown on Map SFHE1).		Yes
The policy “quotes a lack of 5 year supply” as being a reason for building in the countryside. However fails to emphasise the need for a local housing needs analysis. In the case of Shaftesbury the quota of housing building as specified in the 2016 Local Plan and has been exceeded. (i.e. target of housing as defined in the local plan.)		1 Largely covered by the policy	The housing numbers are set out in the supporting text, and the policy refers to the need to consider the planned housing				No
The corruption between shoddy builder and current property developers with the local authority is evident		1 Not possible to address through NP	No evidence of corruption has been found				No
page 29 Persimmon site, 7 built. Map incorrect, White land in between approved for housing. (see Plan)		1 Issue to consider	Agree		Amend map to show parcel 7.	Map updated	Yes
In addition close attention needed to ensure that 'panic building' does not result in slum areas!		1 Covered elsewhere	This is covered in the design and character policies (SFDH)				
Affordable Housing statistical table is inaccurate - during 2017-2018 Churchills had built 42 dwellings and provided approx £220k in Affordable Housing Contributions. Also, at the time there had been affordable houses built in the East of Shaftesbury. (additional comments)	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Covered elsewhere	See Housing and Employment background paper - the housing data has been supplied by the LPA.		The LPA has confirmed the affordable housing S106 funds have been allocated to Shaftesbury		No

SFHE2	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Please take into consideration the strain on local facilities and services / Services to be added to the sites shops/schools/etc.		2 Largely covered by the policy	Also covered in Policy SFHE1				No
Large scale development is not appropriate and needs to be kept in line.		1 Largely covered by the policy					No
I don't think social housing should be mixed in with others. I have lived in both. / Mixed housing is most unsatisfactory for the private home owner as standards of behaviour and management suffer. / Mixed housing encourages discord with values		2 Issue to consider	Mixed tenures reflects both national and local plan policies, based on wider evidence of this working.		No further action required		No
Attempts to block large scale development at one of the District's defined towns would be undermining strategic policies. / Bearing in mind both Wiltshire's and Dorset's significant housing needs, it is wrong to limit housing developments in the vicinity of Shaftesbury to small to medium size (i.e. up to 1 hectare). Larger sites if delivered in a timely manner, can offer significant additional benefits in terms of for example more affordable housing and other community benefits, which may be determined locally. We do note at the end of the policy there is reference to sites larger than 1 hectare, if proposed. Whilst we support the content of this part of the policy, we believe the two elements of the policy, under 1ha and over1 ha, should be read together and that part of the policy related to larger sites should be more positive. / Small developments are not necessarily the answer. Of course they are more popular in an essentially conservative town, but they are unlikely to meet future demands for more housing and with it, more business parks. Larger developments are needed and these should be anticipated and planned for so that they can be integrated into the settlement area. / The land south of the A30 and east of Higher Blandford Road, is a well located, suitable site for development with the potential to provide for a mix of housing to meet the needs of the settlement and should be considered for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Dorset Council, Savills, PCL Planning + 1	Issue to consider	The plan recognises that (1) the town has had significant recent growth and continues to have a healthy supply of land without the need to release more greenfield sites and (2) there is no general community consensus that additional growth is needed. The Dorset Local Plan is the appropriate place to determine what further strategic growth is needed, and the NP can be reviewed when this is done.	Clarify that the Dorset Local Plan is the appropriate place to determine what further strategic growth is needed, and the NP can be reviewed when this is done.	See suggested change under SFHE1 ie "There has been significant expansion of the town in recent years. As of April 2019 there were still 432 dwellings that were permitted or under construction – which is 90% of the planned delivery to 2031. Having regard for the adopted Local Plan's strategy for North Dorset, and the number of sites currently available, there is no obvious need for more housing to be included in this Neighbourhood Plan until such time as it is reviewed, and the existing settlement boundaries are unchanged. [new para] With the review of the Dorset Local Plan now underway, the overlying strategy for Shaftesbury's future development needs to be examined through that process..."	Added in to policy intro on page 32	Yes
Absolutely, but who would be responsible for monitoring any new developments and ensuring planning requirements are fulfilled and standards maintained / Builders need to abide by their original contracts to landscape, renewable energy and carbon footprint issues.		2 Issue to consider	LPA have the power to impose conditions and can require funding to assist with effective monitoring - Government has also recently provided additional funding to cover this		Add in new supporting para (before Details) to read: "Dorset Council are responsible for making sure that planning conditions and obligations are followed. Active monitoring as building works progress can flag up problems at an early stage so that these can be resolved and are less likely to be repeated. On larger sites Dorset Council can include a monitoring fee as part of a section 106 planning obligation, to cover the cost of monitoring the delivery of the obligations.	Text udated	Yes
Quality of build, materials and finishing is poor standard. All properties should have spaces for parking / Would like to see high quality design layout and developers contributing to our towns environment / I grew up in a small market town, it is increasingly becoming spoilt by housing and ugly housing or then no architecture.		3 Covered elsewhere	This is covered in the design and character policies (SFDH). There was no clear evidence to justify a higher level of parking that set out in the county standards.				N/A
Policy SFHE2 – We support the recognition in the policy on page 30, that if sites over 1ha are brought forward, these should be properly master-planned and appropriate infrastructure is delivered alongside the development. A masterplan has already been prepared for land east of Higher Blandford Road and proposes for substantial areas of public open space which would provide a range of opportunities for recreation and leisure, biodiversity enhancements. Contributions towards other infrastructure items where necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind, would be able to be secured through appropriate planning obligations.	PCL Planning	Supportive comment					N/A
This policy has completely omitted the lack control of Road Adoption and the ongoing issue of uncapped Estate Management Fees. The policy needs to state 'Advance Payments Code under Sections 219-225 of the Highways Act 1980 may apply in this instance. The Code secures payment towards the future making-up of a private street prior to the commencement of any building works associated with residential, commercial and industrial development. The intention of the Code is to reduce the liability of potential road charges on any future purchasers which may arise if the private street is not made-up to a suitable standard and adopted as publicly maintained highway.'..... and that all roads in new developments are to be signed off to be adoptable and the timeframe for Road Adoption needs to be agreed up front (2 years). Another example - Dorset Council are progressing a Traffic Regulation Order for the Mampitts Bus Gate prior to initiation of the link road for Wincombe Lane / Developers really must be held to account and made to complete and maintain the landscaping which always features so heavily in their planning submissions but is never achieved. / Can controlling developers ever be more than wishful thinking?!	Maltings Residents Association, Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group + 2	Largely covered by the policy	The policy refers to infrastructure delivered in tandem and each phase is fully completed in a timely manner		Add in new supporting para (before Details) to read: "One example of an issue that needs to be addressed is the timely adoption of highways and related traffic management measures, which has been a cause for concern in some recent developments. The timeframe for adoption should be clearly specified at the outset, and Dorset Council can use their powers under the Highways Act to get funds from the developer that allows them to remedy the situation if the proposed roads are not made-up to a suitable standard to be adopted."	Text updated	Yes

SFHE2	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
I also want express needs for inclusion of mixed use areas / green and social spaces.		1 Largely covered by the policy	Refers to green infrastructure - plus also covered in other policy areas				No
Shared parking areas really should be avoided. They do not achieve anything positive, they are a source of conflict between neighbours and do nothing to reduce car usage. Homes should be built with proper driveways and adequate parking for residents and visitors		1 Issue to consider	It would not be appropriate to prohibit shared parking as this enables the more efficient use of land		No further action required		No
In view of climate breakdown and commitment to net-zero carbon emissions by 2050, suggest developers are required to provide a specified % of energy needs from on-site renewables. Fits with provision of other infrastructure.		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFDH1 - Government guidance makes clear that building regulations are to address the UK's transition to zero carbon buildings				N/A
I seriously wonder if any lessons have been learned or will be learned if the government continue to dictate that North Dorset needs more houses.		1 Not possible to address through NP	The housing growth agreed through the Local Plan is not something that the NP can change				No
The town has been ruined by stupidity and fraudulent decisions by local authority		1 Not possible to address through NP	No evidence of fraud has been found				No
We need social housing. There is no such thing as affordable housing. People need rented accommodation. CLT - great idea.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Planning conditions 'legally binding' not just 'set out'.		1 Largely covered by the policy	Planning conditions or S106 should be imposed if necessary to ensure this policy is complied with				No
Omit 'Landscaping' (a bastard term implying superficial 'afterthought') add - 'comprehensive integrated design of outdoor spaces including land alteration, reshaping, surfaces (permeable/impermeable - mineral/vegetative) planting and artefacts.		1 Covered elsewhere	Landscaping is a well-recognised terms and does not imply that it is an afterthought. More detail is given in Policy SFGI3				N/A
Strongly agree especially with regard to infrastructure, bus, cycle routes and topography. Also educational provision, schools essential.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
There are no policies for house type which support the population trends shown on page 10. Clearly, the table shows importance of houses for 'starter homes' and 'ageing population' - see Jan 2016 NHP.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group + 1	Issue to consider	Whilst affordable provision is specified, the requirement for homes suitable for the ageing population could be made more explicit		Add into supporting text (before details): "In terms of house types, our research has specifically highlighted affordable housing as a priority for the local community, and also the housing needs of our older residents (given that 25% of the population is in the 65+ age group and this is forecast to increase). Innovative forms of housing designed to meet the specific needs of older people (who may be less mobile and have a higher reliance on care and social support networks) should be encouraged. Amend 5th bullet point to read "On sites of 10 or more dwellings, the mix of housing should include dwelling types likely to be suitable for older people and also for those working from home, and avoid being any one type in order to promote social integration."	Text updated	Yes
I have not spotted any reference to NPPF 63 where the threshold for the provision of affordable dwellings in developments can be reduced to 5. The NP seems to be an appropriate vehicle for seeking to achieve affordable dwellings on smaller development sites.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider	There is only a very limited area of AONB land within the NP area, all of which is either developed or has planning consent (Littledown) providing no realistic opportunities to apply this lower threshold		No further action required		No
Require the provision of footpaths, cycleways and other non-vehicular access routes into and out of the town centre and surrounding area (Amendment to policies SFHE2, SFCL3, and projects CL3 and CL4)		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policies are considered to be reasonable - it would not be appropriate to set a blanket requirement as the provision of such routes may be be appropriate on every site.				No
No issues have been learnt from this as houses are still being developed! The field near kingsettle woods has a certain type of weed that cannot be killed off so it keeps coming back. Anyone purchasing a house should be clearly made aware of this when buying houses here as previous builders were made to stop work due to this! It damages houses and so is a huge issue!		1 Comment not understood	Japanese knotwood and similar species are controlled under separate legislation				N/A

SFHE3	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
The location of blackmore vale dairy is increasingly problematic to local residents / facilities on Wincombe lane etc - it must be frustrating for them as much as for residents and I would encourage relocation.	1	Issue to consider	The NP evidence base does not have evidence to show that this is a signifcant problem, and any material intensification of use would be assessed through a planning application. The last application (2015) included a requirement for a travel plan, which was suggested by the applicant to reduce HGV conflicts with school traffic along Wincombe Lane.		No further action required		No
It would be useful to explain more clearly what the land will be safeguarded for (presumably for employment purposes) - consider how this policy will sit with LPP1 Policy 11. While protecting employment sites, Policy 11 also allows a range of supplementary uses on them as detailed by criteria o, p, q, and r. The second paragraph of this policy appears to be unfinished as it does not end with a full stop: "... as employment land will be safeguarded..." / P 31 – can we clarify whether hotels and restaurants could as employment land? Shaftesbury is in need of a budget hotel to develop tourism – south of the A30 is ideal (with restaurant?) . Hotel idea supported on page 78 / I would like to see serious consideration for the A30 space to be used as a bigger drs surgery / hospital complex to complement or replace the abbeyview and Westminster hospital sites - both of which are stretched beyond their capacity / why not a hotel like travel lodge south of A30 on industrial site (Trowbridge) / an we clarify whether hotels and restaurants could as employment land? Shaftesbury is in need of a budget hotel to develop tourism- south of the A30 is deal (with restaurant?) Hotel idea supported on page 78	Dorset Council, Shaftesbury Civic Society + 3	Largely covered by the policy	The Local Plan policy that this would be read in conjunction with has adopted a more flexible approach and will permit other uses that provide employment, but do not fall within the B Class use definitions.	Clarify wider interpretation of employment in the supporting text and clarify policy wording	Amend supporting text by adding additional para at end of section "Which areas are employment land' as follows: "Whilst employment areas include those falling within traditional 'B' Class uses (business and general industrial premises), in practice we need to consider a much wider range of employment types - the education and training sector, leisure and tourism, healthcare etc where the use of that land or building directly supports jobs. Care homes which employ significant levels of staff (equivalent to B1-type uses) should fall to be considered as an employment use, although for obvious reasons these would not be appropriate on established employment areas in close proximity to general industrial uses.	Text amended	Yes
Employment is needed in town centre and would encourage businesses to re-use existing sites. the plan doesn't make mention of how much empty employment/industrial space is in Shaftesbury - and how much of it has been vacant for over 6-12 months - a telling indication of how much business space is needed or whether existing empty areas aren't suitable for 21st century business needs?	1	Covered elsewhere	Policy SFTC1 and SFTC2 support office-based employment in the town centre (though shop fronts uses are restricted to those requiring a customer footfall)	Include additional evidence re vacancy rates			N/A
If land to the south of the A30 has been earmarked for business development, but no demand for this land has yet been demonstrated, it might be reclassified as residential development land taking pressure off other greenfield sites. Improving employment in the area should be furthered by encouraging businesses to move to Shaftesbury and then helping them to find suitable premises. Allocating land for a third business park when the existing areas are not fully utilised seems wasteful.	1	Issue to consider	The employment research identified a relatively low turnover of units on the main industrial estates and only a few currently known to be in the market for sale, letting or assignment (other than the new starter units under construction).	At the current time there is a vacancy of approx 17,000-20,000 sq ft out of a total of 1,000,000 and that represents 2% of the the supply. Component parts are: Co-op Bell Street 14,000; Edinburgh Woollen Mill and 4 other High Street/Salisbury Street units: 5,000. The new build Business Units on the Wincombe Estate are nearly built and will be ready in the New Year which will provide a further 5,000 sq ft in total, and although the Old Glove Factory has 3,500 sq ft at present it is being promoted for an application is on for 6 dwellings. The plan is being set for the period up to 2031 and the plan trajectory shows 1265 new dwellings in the plan area. That represents a large addition to the workforce and to avoid long distance commuting and use of cars for travelling to work/schools/shops etc, having a bank of allocated employment land is the responsible answer.	Add before details to SFHE3 "Our research showed that there were very few vacant employment units, and whilst it may take time to bring on new employment land it is clear that as the workforce grows (as the housing areas are built out) it will be increasingly important to provide opportunities for businesses to locate here if we are to reduce outward commuting."	Text amended	Yes
Absolutely / local employment opportunities vital to prevent (long distance) commute town	2	Supportive comment					N/A
On map SFEA the Old Glove Factory (Inline building) on Wincombe Lane should be retained as an employment area. It is not shown as such on the map.	2	Issue to consider	This is in employment use currently but subject to a planning application for residential (replacement)	Agree appropriate to include within map (unless permission for residential is subsequently granted)	Amend map to include area as employment land	Map amended	Yes
Policy SFHE3. We note this policy recognises the importance of Wincombe Business Park as an employment site and seeks to retain the employment allocation south of the A30. Whilst we support this, could the policy not go further and support any extension of Wincombe Business Park as we propose in our concept plan?	Savills	Not possible to address through NP	The area suggested is in the adjoining parish, outside the Neighbourhood Plan area				

SFHE3	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
There are multiple water supply assets on the proposed employment site (land to the south of the A30). These mains are to be accurately located on site and marked on deposited drawings. There must be no building within 3 metres of this main and no tree planting within 6 metres. Subject to application and engineering agreement it may be possible to divert some mains. If employment uses are proposed which will generate non-domestic flows we recommend early consultation with Wessex Water as uses (such as food and drink manufacture) can place significant demands on water and waste water infrastructure.	Wessex Water	Issue to consider	The site was allocated through the 2003 Local Plan and any impacts on water resources would be assessed through a planning application.		No further action required		No
Policy SFHE3 – The map of employment areas shown on page 32, identifies the proposed employment allocation to the south of the A30 and clearly indicates my client’s land (to the west) is effectively an infill site, surrounded on three sides by existing and proposed development.	PCL Planning	Issue to consider	The Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating additional sites for housing (see response to SFH1)		No further action required		No
The diagram on page 32 of the draft NHP shows the whole area south of A30 as Employment Land. This diagram is incorrect. Land for 22 allotments has been transferred from NDDC to the Town Council and is designated amenity land.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group, Maltings Residents Association	Issue to consider	Agree map requires updating to exclude allotments and that part of the site outside the NP Area		ZM to amend map	Map amended	Yes
The land shown as employment only actually includes the land reserved for the reserved Bypass Corridor and the Travelers site.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group, Maltings Residents Association	Issue to consider	Agree map requires updating to exclude land protected for the bypass corridor	BL Check re Traveller's site	ZM to amend map	Map amended	Yes
I disagree with the NHP mentioning a planning application (Persimmon Sth A30) on p31 in an attempt to influence individuals against this planning application. I think this may be an abuse of the NHP process and I am not too sure of the legal implications either considering a company has been singled out indiscriminately; especially when Shaftesbury is being inflicted with multiple development companies with planning application wishing to do worse acts of destruction on the open countryside. I personally find this page outrageous considering the housing is within the Brownfield Site and the Town Council removed 7 objections against building 170 houses on AONB land for Littledown. The priority for any NHP or any Local Plan is to prioritize building on Brownfield sites prior to building on AONB! The NHP appears to be stating the opposite. The ATS site planning application for 18 houses doesn't include any Affordable Housing - why isn't this mentioned? Or the Planning Applications that have gone to Appeal which are hoping to build outside the Settlement Boundary - why aren't these mentioned?	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Issue to consider	The A30 site is identified as it is an existing site allocation for employment - and the decision recent planning application is relevant in whether this area remains available. The previous decision on the ATS site (which was for sheltered housing) was in 2017 and pre-dated the NP and therefore the loss of employment here has been accepted. There are no sites at appeal impacting on employment land.		No further action required		No
Agree but would like to see promotion of/encouragement for sustainable businesses and industry.		1 Largely covered by the policy	See climate change introduction which cross-references the various policies promoting sustainable development				No
Could we attract more small innovative companies? Maybe High Tech. Are Wi-Fi and mobile signals in need of improvement? There are outdated brownfield industrial estates that perhaps could start to be redeveloped.		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy would not preclude this - it is trying to retain and promote available employment land				No
Developers do not care		1 Not possible to address through NP					No
business and industrial parks for employment opportunities need to be prioritised if residential building is expanded.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Land South of A30 must be retained for employment		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Page 31 last paragraph - Outside the Neighbourhood Plan border (Area not border) in Motcombe		1 Issue to consider	Agree area better terminology	Amend text to refer to NP area	Amended		Yes
Page 32 Current Ambulance and Fire Station - incongruous location, noise/disturbance Issues, their location with in built up, busy areas. Policy - Relocate, consolidate, where Strategic role and location necessary.		1 Issue to consider	Noise and amenity would be considered in any change of use		No further action required		Yes
This so depends on the buildings being sympathetic to the environment and the effect on traffic access.		1 Covered elsewhere	This is covered in the design and character policies (SFDH)				N/A
70% of all traffic is local and therefore many of the solutions are just that, local. Whilst employment land is still being taken over by greedy, discredited developers for housing then any new residents are more likely to have to out commute leaving both Shaftesbury and Gillingham as dormitory towns. Housing and employment is needed together.		1 Supportive comment					N/A

SFHE3	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Encourage development that promotes working from home, living above retail premises, and local employment opportunities (Extension of SFHE3)	1	Issue to consider	Specific reference to home-working (whilst not necessarily requiring planning permission) could be usefully added in this context. Policy SFTC1 supports living above retail premises.	Include reference to flexible designs that would allow home working to be encouraged under Policy SFHE2.	Add additional supporting text to end of new para on house types (under SFHE2): "With at least 1 in 20 of workers working from home, this is also a consideration. Updated Building Regulations now require all new homes to be designed to support gigabit-capable networks - but having some homes that include ground floor space capable of use and as a home office / workshop and associated storage would be desirable." See also change to policy ("On sites of 10 or more dwellings, the mix of housing should include dwelling types likely to be suitable for older people and also for those working from home....")	Text amended	Yes
Post it - show on employment map- Ambulance station, Beauty Shop on Park wlk, Trinity Centre, Hatia Café on Mustons lane, Spar on Mampitts sq, Abbey Museum Shop. No longer hotels - 5 Bimport and 15 Parsons Pool.	1	Issue to consider	Agreed	Amend map to show additional employment areas (categorised appropriately) and provide further explanation in supporting text as to what is meant by the employment areas.	Map will be amended ZM.	Map amended	Yes

SFHE4	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Not necessary when seeing proper congestion in other parts of the country where the need is far more urgent / Building more roads is rarely the answer to traffic problems - it generally leads to more traffic when we should be doing all we can to reduce the use of motor transport. / will split traffic both sides of the area not divert and resolve. Closer to where I live, so will not be impressed if increase in traffic noise / Will never understand The Shaftesbury Eastern Bypass theory / We must reduce traffic not increase road capacity.		5 Issue to consider	Traffic is perceived to be a major issue by local residents. The traffic counts highlight the increasing flows and large volumes of traffic. The policy was subject to considerable local support.		No further action required		No
If the Eastern Bypass means diverting traffic to and from BV Dairy and from the Maltings Estate on to a slip road at the top of Wincombe Lane and into Shaftesbury town it would mean far more heavy traffic down narrow Wincombe Lane which has a school, nursery and playing field in it causing a danger to the children crossing the road. The lane is already congested enough with heavy milk tankers and lorries visiting the dairy night and day. The Maltings Estate needs another exit but not down Wincombe Lane.		1 Not possible to address through NP	The detailed design of the bypass has yet to be undertaken, would be subject to consultation by the highway authority.				No
All of A350 needs attention! No lorries on the C13 either.		1 Not possible to address through NP	The C13 is not within the parish (and is therefore not in the NP area)				No
Get the bypass! / High priority - the existing bypass is an emissions corridor / Definitely needed, especially if supermarkets / retail outlets introduced into cattle market area etc - which will bring further increased traffic. / There is a need for another road, traffic has increased throughout the country it is a national not a solely local problem / Yes, Strong need for the protection of this bypass		5 Supportive comment					N/A
The more roads we build, the more traffic we generate. We are on the cusp of change and should be challenging this auto-response. The destruction of the countryside north and south of the bypass corridor should be taken into account in any decisions. And the impact on the newly resident population in the east of the town – noise, pollution, loss of access to open country.... / The Eastern corridor would sever the green corridors running out to the paths and bridle ways to the east of Shaftesbury which form an important part of the Town's green infrastructure. / The concern for heavy traffic passing along Christy's Lane includes the comments that this is a road 'lined with residential properties'. The proposed eastern by-pass route passes alongside many residential properties and crosses the drainage sump ponds for the surface water at The Maltings. The area has rapidly become abundant with wildlife following the development works with protected species thriving in the green spaces. The siting of a by-pass so close to many houses and valuable green spaces is totally unacceptable. Better to cross the pasture land to the North East of Blackmore Vale Dairy and on the Shaftesbury side of the boundary of St Mary's School. This could then still connect with the Wincombe Business Park which I believe is the intention. However, this is all academic as I believe landowners or stakeholders at Compton Abbas will not relinquish land for road-building. / I am not sure about this as wonder what other suggestions are being considered for 'by-pass'. Some could well destroy aspects of Shaftesbury / Safeguard line of bypass for alternative walking/cycling routes / retain as walking/cycling route - not for vehicles. The more roads we build the more traffic we generate. The destruction of the countryside N & S of this corridor should be taken into account of any discussions.	Tree Group + 6	Issue to consider	The detailed design of the bypass has yet to be undertaken, but would include biodiversity and noise mitigation measures and would be subject to consultation by the highway authority.		No further action required		No
There is a strong desire for a 30mph speed limit between Littledown and the Royal Chase roundabout, this is not a 40mph bypass anymore, but a busy road through the centre of the population.		1 Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP - note Project CL5				No
Bearing in mind the land in the control of the landowner consortium we represent, we could help facilitate the provision of the northern part of this road, alongside our residential and employment proposals.	Savills	Supportive comment					N/A
Yes, but care needs to be taken to ensure any proposed future bypass doesn't result in further expansion eastwards. Thereby becoming another split in an expanded town		1 Not possible to address through NP	This Neighbourhood Plan does not promote any housing growth beyond the line of the bypass - the strategic decision on where future growth may be will be a matter for the Local Plan				No
Until such time as Shaftesbury by-pass is built and in view of the need to encourage more walking/cycling, suggest the town pursues policies/projects that aim to reduce the health and safety hazards for pedestrians and cyclists using Christy's Lane & Grosvenor Road- i.e. protecting/enhancing trees and hedgerows that mitigate pollution, enhanced integrated cycleways, reduced speed limit.		1 Covered elsewhere	Project CL5 – Improve diversity and attractiveness of existing footpaths and cycle routes				N/A
A30, A350 and C13 traffic would flow much better if the approaches to the roundabouts were clearly marked and the entrances to the roundabouts were realigned to allow vehicles to queue side by side.		1 Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP	<i>Traffic management comments to be passed onto the TAG</i>			No
Pedestrian crossings should be timed by 3 seconds less. Have witnessed several quite severely physically disabled pedestrians crossing with adequate time.		1 Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP	<i>Traffic management comments to be passed onto the TAG</i>			No
The designated route for HGVs as agreed by the police, the Freight Haulage Association and Dorset County Council from the Poole/Bournemouth Conurbation to the Midlands does not and has never been through North Dorset. The B and C roads are not more fuel efficient for long distance travel. Journey times are unreliable as admitted in the overview.		1 Issue to consider	Plan checked and no such references to HGV routing found.		No further action required		No
To reduce CO2 the traffic lights on the A30 should revert to A30 priority rather than Shaftesbury East priority as there is relatively little traffic exiting on to the A30 from there.		1 Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP	<i>Traffic management comments to be passed onto the TAG</i>			No
SFHE4 - In the penultimate paragraph on page 33 I think the text should read 'south or south east' and not 'north or north east'.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider	Agree	Correct directional text	Amended		Yes
Whilst the point is made that the original bypass – Christy's Lane – now splits the town rather than bypassing it the document could state more obviously that it does not make good sense to have development on the outer side of a bypass. It follows from that that there is not much scope for additional development in the NP area! The NP might legitimately, therefore, indicate that the Local Plan should look elsewhere for significant development whilst the NP concentrates on ensuring the character, qualities, and services of the settlement are sustained and, where appropriate, enhanced.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider	Agree	Include additional text on pg 29 (re Policy SFHE1) highlighting limited opportunities	See suggested changes under SFHE1		Yes

SFHE4	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
The AONB suggests it may not assist the ‘making’ of the NP if a route for an eastern bypass is reserved without a clear indication that such a route is both practicable and feasible north and south of the town. Whilst the Local Plan is the place for the identification of strategic routes a Neighbourhood Plan can comment on the issues and the potential positive and negative impacts of such proposals on the Neighbourhood Area. It may, therefore, be relevant to consider a western bypass route that could provide easier and quicker links between Shaftesbury, Gillingham, Sturminster Newton, and Blandford whilst also providing an enhanced link to the A303, reducing impacts of the A350 on villages, and a better route southwards.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Not possible to address through NP	The NP does not have evidence to support a different route alignment than that previously identified by the Highways Authority.				No
Some Council members perhaps do their best against gov policy - not fit for purpose	1	Comment not understood					N/A

SFG11	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Section 4.1, page 36 - Last paragraph of middle column – by “national standards” do you mean “Fields In Trust standards”? In which case, these aren’t presented until the section on Community and Leisure on page 77. Also, the entire sentence needs to be revisited as it doesn’t make complete sense.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree	Revisit text to simplify and clarify	P.36 foot of 2nd column: Replace 'We have applied the national standards formula to the amount of green spaces that a community could expect, to assess what is currently provided for; formal sports grounds, equipped play areas, parks and gardens, allotments and accessible open areas. Shaftesbury falls short of the recommended national standards. That means it is really important to protect the existing open spaces close to where people live.' with 'Shaftesbury's residents need access to parks and gardens, sports fields, allotments and open countryside. The wellbeing of local children and young people also depends on areas for play being close to where they live. The town's ability to meet these needs is limited. Map SFHE1 showed that as the town has grown to the east the flattish land needed for sports and amenity areas has been lost to development. This is dealt with in more detail in Section 6, Community & Leisure.'	P.36 Reconsider quick read here? This is the intro section - not a policy.	Yes
'Protecting Shaftesbury’s special green spaces’ page 38 Second paragraph – green spaces aren’t listed in the document appendix but in a separate accompanying document (also the Green Space Audit is formatted as a large table and much of the text appears to be missing due to the width of the columns and height of the rows) / Does the Green Infrastructure include relatively permanent green spaces such as churchyards and cemeteries; I do not know the details of the built up areas well enough to determine the answer from the relatively small plan.	Dorset Council, Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider	Agree	Include simplified list of LGS and ITA in an appendix as well as the more detailed but separate audit (with formatting issue corrected) - including numbering on map to enable easy cross referencing.	P.38 Retain only the first para. Replace the remaining text in column one with new paragraphs as below. 'Provided areas are local in character, within the Neighbourhood Plan area, and not needed for development, they can be designated as Local Green Spaces (or LGS). The rules on what can and can’t be designated are defined by national planning policy. Within Shaftesbury's development boundary there are a number of green spaces with tree cover that are important for their contribution to the character of Shaftesbury, but they have either limited or no public access. Historically, many of these were classed as Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWAs) and these have been identified as Important Treed Areas (ITAs) in this plan. The trees will have additional protection from felling where they are within the conservation area or have an existing Tree Preservation Order. The justification for designation of spaces as LGS or ITA is given within the descriptions provided in the separate Audit document.'	include ref number on maps	Yes
Make sure that all attempts have been made to correctly identify the owners of sites proposed for LGS status and to notify them for their comments.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree - the landowners were identified and consulted in advance of the Reg 14 consultation.			No further action	No
The Dorset Council owned school playing fields have been proposed for LGS. School playing fields are invariably not open to general public access and do not need to be designated as LGS as they are protected under section 77, (School Standards and Framework Act 1998) and cannot be disposed of without Secretary of State consent. Additional constraints on their use is unnecessary. The Policy SFG11 however helpfully allows for development on LGS's if it is compatible with their designation. This is welcomed as this potentially would not prejudice schools development on schools playing fields. We would however suggest that ‘minor’ be deleted from the policy as this is unnecessary in this context.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Whilst there is a statutory process required for the disposal of school land, this is related to transfer of ownership and does not in itself prohibit the area's development. The wording 'minor in nature' is consider to convey that any building works should not be substantial in the context of the space and its reason for designation - however this may be better expressed as 'must not cause substantial harm'	Reword policy as "...will only be permitted if it is compatible with, and not cause substantial harm to, the space’s character and continued use"	P.39 Reword 1st para of Policy so it starts 'The areas shown on Map SFG11 and listed in Appendix xx are designated as Local Green Spaces (LGS). ...' Also amend 2nd para of Policy so it starts 'Development within a Local Green Space will only be permitted if it is compatible with, and does not cause substantial harm to, the space’s character and continued use....' Then amend 3rd para to start 'The Important Treed Areas, as shown on Map SFG11 and identified within Appendix xx, should retain their treed character. ...'	Please add correct Appendix ref (twice)	Yes
There is no interest in protecting green space - all of our beautiful areas in Shaftesbury have been or are being built on without any consideration to people that have lived here all there life. If we wanted to live in a city we would move to London! / Good as far as it goes, but no doubt the property developers will take cavalier decisions		2 Not possible to address through NP	The plan cannot reverse previous decisions, but should be able to protect those important local spaces that remain.				No
In principal I agree with this policy, However, the kind of trees in the brown areas should be considered- sycamore is not a good tree to be encouraged,		1 Issue to consider	Expert advice was sought from the tree group and list of appropriate tree types (Appx H) includes sycamores - these do contribute significantly to the treed character of the area			No further action required	No
The SUDS lie in the bypass corridor - conflict of policies.		1 Issue to consider		Consider overlap with bypass corridor	No longer LGS but referred to as important to local people on P39		Yes

SFG11	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Does not go far enough. Park walk is an embarrassing suburban let-down. The area would benefit from removal of modern abbey wall and greening of tarmac area. / what about the green spaces that have been destroyed past Christy's lane by council activities in the last 5 years - i.e. grubbing up of hedgerow to Mampitts cemetery, etc also is does this relate also to provision of playing areas? The playing facilities are all tired and constantly broken / Make Park Walk much greener with less tarmac and wilder more biodiverse spaces, less municipal / Broadly agree but would have liked to have seen more on management of green spaces.		4 Covered elsewhere	The plan cannot reverse previous decisions, but should be able to ensure mistakes are not repeated in the future. See also Project GI1 –3 that are about working with local landowners and relevant groups to conserve and enhance the Green Infrastructure		P89 Project GI1 Replace wording from ' . We should ... risk.' with ' , protecting eligible open spaces through Fields in Trust where suitable. The aim will be to achieve multiple benefits from each Green Infrastructure element - including recreational value for all ages, enhanced biodiversity, educational opportunities, food growing, mitigating climate change and the reduction of pollution risk.'	Change makes a greater difference between GI1 & GI3	Yes
But trees need to be strongly protected. A mature tree is very different to a sapling.		1 Covered elsewhere	see Policy SFGI3				N/A
More green spaces the better		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Signs for open spaces e.g. Castle Hill are too long. A small sign attached to the gate would suffice.		1 Covered elsewhere	Project CL3 and CL4 are about improving signage				N/A
Policy must include constant possibility of additions and extensions if climate emergency and biodiversity mitigation is to be seriously faced. / add possibility of extensions and additions of climate mitigation and biodiversity		2 Covered elsewhere	see Policy SFGI3				N/A
Tree planting in view of climate change should be encouraged		1 Supportive comment					N/A
The Wilderness is marked as a local green space as opposed to an important treed area. Is this intentional? / Page 40: Suggested Change colour coding of Wilderness - suggest Wilderness is important 'treed' area;	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group + 2	Issue to consider	The site is highly valued by the local community (as shown by recent public comments) and is also of historic interest (linked to the quarry working for the abbey) and it is private land is accessed and viewed from public rights of way. The LGS is considered a more robust and appropriate protect				No
The new, publically accessible, parkland at Littledown could [should?] be shown on p40.	Cranborne Chase AONB + 1	Issue to consider	The designation can only be applied to existing green spaces within the parish boundary. However it would be sensible to include green space commitments.	Include green space commitments and indicate that such land should be safeguarded for that use (and that such areas may be eligible for LGS in a future review).	P39. Replace 'Some are associated with scheduled monuments ' with 'Shaftesbury has green spaces that are linked to highly valued historic sites, wooded spaces that contribute to the character of the town and mitigate climate change, and spaces that give access to long views. Other spaces are valuable to nearby residents because they offer play or other recreational opportunities. Such spaces have been designated for protection from development where they qualify. Some important spaces could not be designated at this time. New development at Littledown to the north of the town will provide a significant area of parkland giving long views over Gillingham Royal Forest. This will become an important landscape feature and leisure area but cannot be said to be 'valued' until public access is made available. It may, however be eligible for LGS designation at the first review of this Neighbourhood Plan. A further important space is the semi-natural area with ponds that has been created by the sustainable urban drainage system on the south-eastern edge of the town. This is used for play and dog-walking and is becoming an important asset for the many people living nearby for whom there is currently no readily accessible alternative. However, part of the area sits within the 'by-pass corridor' (see Policy SFHE4) and this potential future development means that protection is not appropriate.	Check inclusion of the SUDS corridor here - the intention was to flag up the important use of this space in case the situation changes or if the road is built and we need some alternative. Insert the right Appendix link for LGS&ITA lists.	Yes
Inclusion of part of Boyne Hollow within boundary? / Patch of land nr Boyne Mead classified as IOWA (+TPO) needs to be featured on map and in audit		2 Issue to consider	Boyne Hollow - to be checked.	check map and status			Yes
Inclusion of Holyrood Farm?		1 Issue to consider	Holyrood Farm is on the lower slopes and part of an important view from Gold Hill and Park Walk - it is too extensive for LGS designation and is not extensively wooded.			No further action	No
all available space for more trees and biodiversity along with educating about their importance		1 Not possible to address through NP	LGS designation cannot be applied to extensive tracts of land - however the plan is not proposing development in the countryside				No
There is good scientific evidence to support need for green spaces		1 Supportive comment			P.89 Reinforce project GI2. Replace existing wording with 'Where new green spaces become accessible to the community, use the national standards for space provision compared with what exists in the town, alongside the need for climate change mitigation and biodiversity enhancement, to determine priorities for use and management of the space and to decide on funding allocation.'		Yes

SFG11	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
The map showing the Open Spaces in Shaftesbury is incorrect. It does not include spaces on the Persimmon Master Plan, the location of the Sth A30 Allotments (22 Allotments) or the 10 acres of land owned by the Town Council for the Cricket Club. / SOSG supports more green spaces on the East of Shaftesbury as defined in the 2016 Local Plan, therefore, the East of Shaftesbury Community Areas defined & designated in ND Local Plan 2016 policy 18 & s106 agreements for Open Spaces in East of Shaftesbury need to be shown and a policy supporting their implementation - these include Sth A30 22 Allotments; Community Land for East of Shaftesbury Community Hall, parking, allotments and play area. / Add in A30 allotments and Mampitts Sq (pending transfer)	Maltings Residents Association, Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group, + 1	Issue to consider	The designation can only be applied to existing green spaces within the parish boundary. However it would be sensible to include green space commitments.	Include green space commitments on the map on pg 46, and indicate that such land should be safeguarded for that use (and that such areas may be eligible for LGS in a future review). Also include project regarding application of Fields in Trust status for public owned land - as this can extend outside the NP area.		This map now being adapted for C&L section.	Yes
It is difficult to see how accurate the FIT metrics have been applied and recorded in the NHP in light of the East of Shaftesbury s106 contributions. These financial contributions have not been recorded. With the agreement of Planning Application for Parcel 6 & 7 it was agreed that the triangle of land for Bypass Corridor could also be used temporarily for community use. It is currently used for walking dogs. This is also not indicated on the Open Space Audit.	Maltings Residents Association, Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Issue to consider	The FIT metrics will be re-checked following any changes from this consultation	Update Table on pg 77 following any changes to the green spaces audit		Fit table updated	Yes
Page 39. *par 1* Scheduled ancient monuments which are statutorily protected. Local Green Spaces (LGS) is a statutory designation. They require extremely stringent justification. This depiction of so many on the plan is not realistically achievable. (terminology SO important)		1 Issue to consider	The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 refers to 'scheduled monuments' and this terminology is used by Historic England. LGS are not a statutory designation per se (other than through the Local Plan) and the GI Audit provides the justification for the spaces selected in the NP area	Check references re scheduled ancient monuments and correct.			Yes
Page 40. Distinguish between; open spaces as land use and visually open or wooded areas. Publically accessible and private. NB to have clear plan and e.g categories.		1 Covered elsewhere	Map shows LGS and important treed areas in different shading.				N/A
Categories to be enhanced e.g - treed area on Pine Walk not shown etc. Breach Common is an open area but is also 'wooded' but has limited access. Public/private land and accessibility must be mapped clearly.		1 Covered elsewhere	This information is contained in the GI audit				N/A
Feel this vital		1 Supportive comment					N/A
36. GI - Define Green Infrastructure. System of network of open spaces and movement corridors. Varied character and multi-f.l. functions. Desirable 'multi-functionable'. Urban forest - vegetative cover and functions etc. (more philosophically - 'integration of natural and man made systems')		1 Issue to consider	Agree that GI has not been defined in the plan - although this needs to be in plain English	Include brief definition of green infrastructure under 'quick read' heading or elsewhere in the introduction	P36 Insert before 1st para. 'Green infrastructure is the network of natural and semi-natural features, green spaces and waterways that intersperse and connect villages, towns and cities. It ranges from pastures and woodland to playing fields and street trees. Within a town, each green infrastructure element may have an obvious primary function but will also bring many other benefits. For example street trees can enhance a residential area but also serve to reduce airborne pollution, provide shade and shelter, support insects and birds, and mitigate climate change.'		Yes
36. Add: In contrast to the open rolling Chalk Downlands, are the flatter low-lying areas of the Blackmore Vale with it's characteristics mosaic of hedgrows, copses and wooded remnants of the Gillingham Royal Forest. Add a plan.		1 Issue to consider	The landscape character type surrounding the town is 'rolling vales'	The landscape character is broadly protected under LP Policy 4 - consider whether there needs to be additional mention of the Rolling Vale characteristics in the supporting text / policies	P36. 1st column replace 'Shaftesbury's distinctiveness comes from its place in the landscape. Our historic town rests on an even more ancient Saxon settlement. We have evolved and grown, yet our hilltop town nestles amongst trees. From the surrounding countryside much of Shaftesbury is hidden from view.' with 'Shaftesbury's distinctiveness comes from its elevated position above undulating countryside characterised as Rolling Vales to the north, west and south. Our historic hilltop town boasts some outstanding open views yet from the surrounding countryside much of Shaftesbury is hidden, nestling amongst the extensive tree cover.' Then delete the paragraph at foot of 1st column i.e. 'We enjoy glimpses of the countryside beyond the buildings or trees. The town boasts outstanding open views.'	P36. Replace photo of Park Walk with image of 'Rolling Vales'	Yes
37. Trees: increase tree cover. Town tree strategy, functions. Trees as essential urban functional requirement not decorative afterthought. Retro-fit trees in older housing and employment areas and along woods and footpaths.		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFG13 and Projects GI1 – GI3				N/A
Post it - Supplementary map to accompany public access spaces that are part of standard provision		1 Covered elsewhere	See map on pg 46				N/A
Post it - Signage req, for cycle route proposed including link to national cycleways		1 Covered elsewhere	Project CL4				N/A

SFGI1	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
The existing trees at The Cliff which currently provide screening for the development from the Vale of Gillingham could [should?] be shown on p40.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider	This area is outside the NP boundary	Check and remove any other designations that go outside the NP boundary			Yes
The projects list could also focus on seeking to make the town more resilient to the effects of climate change, possibly in connection with green spaces and tree planting.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Covered elsewhere	Project GI1 – Conserve and enhance the Green Infrastructure				N/A
TYPO?	1				P.37 final paragraph. Delete 'and communal spaces for allotments and' and replace with 'and communal spaces with'	To action	Yes
P.39 Quick Read	1				P.39 Quick Read - Delete the 3 paras here and simplify text	To action	Yes

SFGI2	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Page 29 (refers to Policy SFGI2) - please use the wording - steeper and shallower slopes should be critically sensitive as opposed to very sensitive	Shaftesbury Civic Society	Issue to consider	The wording 'very sensitive' conveys the same general meaning and is considered appropriate				No
What assessment has been undertaken to underpin the different shaded areas shown and indicated as on higher/lower ground, shallow/steep and sensitive to development?	PCL Planning	Issue to consider	The assessment has been based on a review of local topography, landscape cover and local knowledge. It takes forward and more clearly identifies the 2003 Local Plan policy SB1 which refers to "the hill-top character of the town will be conserved by retaining all remaining open or wooded areas around the slopes." and associated policy SB3	Consider including further explanation in the supporting text of the methodology used	P.41 In the first para (in bold) remove text which is duplicated later and edit at the end and then replace remaining text up to the Policy to more clearly explain the new Slopes Map (Map SFHE1) and how it has been created.	Include picture of detail from Bernard's map on P41. ('Slope analysis detail')	Yes
No evidence appears to have been presented, to explain how the viewpoints shown on pages 42 and 43 have been identified.	PCL Planning	Issue to consider	Explain view selection and assessment basis here	Consider including further explanation in the supporting text of the methodology used	Remove P.43. Retain (revised) Map SFGI2. Include a new section after the Policy to be headed 'Shaftesbury's Viewpoints' and include explanatory text eg 'Shaftesbury's distinctive topography (Map SFHE1) provides outstanding views from the town. Shaftesbury's best known view, famous not just in Dorset but also used in promoting England overseas, is that available from Gold Hill (viewpoint C on Map SFGI2). This historic cobbled street runs down the steep slope behind the Guildhall and from the top the view across Blackmore Vale is framed by picturesque cottages and part of Shaftesbury Abbey walls. - and continue giving examples from the other views	Add appropriate ref no. for the views Appendix.	Yes
Viewpoint D appears to have been taken from within my client's land off Higher Blandford Road. This site isn't currently publicly accessible and there are no public rights of way across the site. Viewpoint D does not therefore reflect a public view.	PCL Planning	Issue to consider	The photograph was taken from public land (grass verge on new Upper Blandford Road)				No
Totally failed so far - what will change if the council is paid enough by developers		1 Not possible to address through NP	The plan cannot reverse previous decisions, but should be able to ensure mistakes are not repeated in the future.				No
Very important to keep the slopes policy esp North of Enmore green. One new proposed development near New Lane should be refused even an appeal.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
But, tree growth must be controlled and trimmed back where necessary to maintain views from park walk settlements over St James and beyond. / Please allow for responsible management of trees on southern slopes to maintain the wonderful views from Park Walk		2 Not possible to address through NP	The policy does not impact on the maintenance of trees - although all tree work within the Conservation Area requires consent from Dorset Council				No
No more building on our protected slopes- Enmore Court example.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Remember the economic value of tourism- do not sacrifice the unique Saxon hilltop silhouette has already been sacrificed to housing from the airfield view point.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
And get the sheep back.		1 Not possible to address through NP					No
The slopes policy should be more prohibitive regarding the developments on the steeper slopes.		1 Issue to consider	The policy is considered to be relatively strong and appropriate to the context			Slopes policy refined	Yes
Tree planting policy needed		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFGI3 and Projects GI1 – GI3				N/A
There should be no development on the shallow slopes outside of the settlement boundary. / p41 needs to be made clearer – there should be NO development on shallow slopes outside the settlement boundary.		2 Issue to consider	It is considered that there is scope for development in these areas (outside of those parts identified as LGS or important treed areas) that would retain the tree cover (which is important) and not impinge on important views. The policy has been worded therefore to allow this flexibility, albeit that such opportunities may be few and far between.			No further action required	No

SFGI2	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
SFG12 Views: ‘prospect and refuge’ are very important to this town – looking out from a place of safety over a wide area is something to treasure – it distinguishes this place and must be protected. Intervisibility demonstrates the ancient importance of this place – from here we see Hambledon, Glastonbury etc and they see us see historic comments		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Comprehensive view cones showing point and spread of views more important. Written description duplicates photo captions. Localised 'glimpes' and meaningful with in the Town. / A better way of showing important views needs to be researched – the arrows are not working / Post it - Policy SFGI2 - Viewpoints out better illustrated with widening arrows		3 Issue to consider	The view arrows are also accompanied by photos (on the following page)	Consider the need to expand the view descriptions and use of cones to show viewspread		This is now the approach taken	Yes
Climate emergency and biodiversity loss – Town Tree Plan needed. (our swifts, swallows, house martins for example are dwindling in numbers)		1 Covered elsewhere	This is broadly covered under Project GI3 but could be made more explicit	Include strategic tree planting project (linked to Project GI3)		Done	Yes
Yes - Will be difficult for housing to be built on the majority of slopes, but protection overall will be a great benefit for the green spaces and unique slopes loved by residents and tourists		2 Supportive comment					N/A
Policy SFGI2 makes various references to maps but it is not always clear which one. As noted above, it would be useful if all maps were numbered so that they can be unambiguously referred to. It is also noted that some maps are very similar – for example, the map on page 44 is very similar to 29 – so consider whether both are required as it's not usually helpful to present the same information more than once.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree	Cross-refer to maps and review maps to reduce overlap	P.41 Make the following changes to the Policy wording: in 1st para replace text in brackets with '(as indicated on Map SFGI2)'; in 2nd para replace text in brackets with '(as shown on Map SFHE1) any '; then in 3rd para replace text '(as mapped), the design, scale and location of the ' ... with ... '(as on SFHE1), the design, scale and location of any '	Amended	Yes
Littledown is an outrageous disaster by corrupt and no doubt fraudulent planning decisions		1 Not possible to address through NP	No evidence of fraud has been found				No
Page 41. Avoid 'soft landscaped edge' term - substitute e.g. 'All new developments should reflect the landscape and environmental context in their site planning, and comprehensive landscape master plans produced to indicate land alteration, SUDs, and the surface cover, planting and artefacts'.		1 Issue to consider	The wording used is considered more appropriate for the policy aim (as explained in the quick read - we want new developments on the edge of town to blend in with the countryside)	Consider moving some of the explanation from the QR to the supporting text	P.41 Replace para 4 of the policy with the modified wording below: 'Development on the edge of the town will be expected to respect the environmental context, including green infrastructure that draws the rural landscape into the settlement and provides a soft edge to the town.'		Yes
Page 42. Increasing number and extent of Solar farms, light buildings, employment/storage areas.		1 Not possible to address through NP	The plan cannot reverse previous decisions, but should be able to provide an appropriate framework for future decisions.				No
Page 44. new more extensive category required, critical ridge edge e.g. Little Down.		1 Issue to consider	The steep slopes category is considered to include any critical ridges. However this point can perhaps be better conveyed in the supporting text	Include in supporting text further description of where there are critical ridgelines		Now included	Yes
Legend Blue - unclear terminology. Pink - add 1:3 and steeper. Map requires refinement, fuzzy, unclear.		1 Issue to consider	Check map for clarity	Update map as appropriate for clarity			Yes
The slopes topography are essential especially at this point in history/ecology		1 Supportive comment					N/A
The slope analysis is particularly relevant to a hill town like Shaftesbury and is an excellent basis for analysing the options being considered by the NP group.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Supportive comment					N/A
Views to and from Shaftesbury are significant in making Shaftesbury special and locally distinctive, and I suggest those aspects could be emphasised earlier in the document.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Covered elsewhere	Views are mentions on pg 12 (under vision)				N/A
I note that the view from Littledown, being provided as a public benefit flowing from the Littledown development, is not shown on p42 nor in the associated text. In many ways it is quite surprising that for a hill town there are [or will be!] only 5 major views outward.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider	This site is not currently accessible to the public, so cannot be designated at this time.	Note in supporting text that this may well be an important view in the future		Referred to both as potential LGS and for important public viewpoint	Yes

SFGI3	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Not worked so far		1 Not possible to address through NP	The plan cannot reverse previous decisions, but should be able to provide an appropriate framework for future decisions.				No
Who determines what is considered right for the area. Do not let house builders make this decision. Past experience shows they aren't to be trusted.		1 Covered elsewhere	Explanation of how this plan's status and how it will be used is contained in the introduction (pg 6)				N/A
Tree group to be consulted actively.		1 Issue to consider	Whilst the Tree Group is not a statutory consultee, it is able to comment on planning applications as advertised by Dorset Council. The Tree Group would be consulted by the Town Council as the various projects are developed.		P.89 Project enhancement - update to include reference re Development of suitable maintenance and planting schemes: working with local landowners, developers, relevant local groups and experts to manage and maintain our green infrastructure in ways that mitigate climate change and enhance biodiversity...	Amended	Yes
Opportunity to think of verges and the main approaches into Shaftesbury a potential green spaces and encourage a more natural and eco friendly approach		1 Covered elsewhere	These have been considered in the audit and Project GI1				N/A
More green spaces the better, don't wish to have feeling of begin on a housing estate		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Planting schemes should not only take cognisance of locally abundant vegetation – trees and hedgerow mixes, but also mention the need for ongoing research into climate change offering potential for other trees, for example to withstand disease, warming and extremes of wind and weather. More tree planting in car parks. More wild flower encouragement and safeguarding along all verges and park areas. More fruit trees for us and for wild life.		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy refers to biodiversity, local food production and climate change	Consider whether some additional supporting text may be helpful	P.96 Appendix Replace heading 'Local Tree Species' with 'Shaftesbury Trees' and replace text below heading 'Locally abundant trees that are indigenous to this area - planting scheme for new and existing areas' with 'A list of native and non-native trees suitable for planting locally. Given changing environmental conditions expert advice should be sought as to what it is best to plant where.' P.45 Para at top centre column. Remove 'native to the area and...' then replace '... local species ...' with 'tree species'	Amended	Yes
Suggest the described benefits required from green spaces within a development should be expected unless there are mitigating circumstances demonstrable by the developer.		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy states that the design of green spaces within a development should, where practical, allow for multiple benefits	Consider whether some additional supporting text may be helpful	P.45 Policy wording at foot of column 1. Replace the para and bullets with 'The design of green spaces within a development must 1. Contribute to the character of the town. 2. Mitigate climate change, contribute to the achievement of net-zero carbon emissions, and provide opportunities for sustainable drainage. 3. Enhance biodiversity as required by Dorset Biodiversity Protocol. Then add - In addition, where practical, these spaces should 1. Enhance tree cover. 2. Provide new habitats to enhance the town's ecological network 3. Enable local food production. 4. Provide educational opportunities 5. Provide opportunities for play and recreation including walking and cycling.	Jo please check this. Want to distinguish between reasonable requirement and what is simply desirable whilst reinforcing the need for net biodiversity enhancement. And the layout will need addressing.	Yes
Yes - green spaces, tree lined streets, and plantation all have great benefits for both physical and mental health, a point which has had many studies (and an area I have heavily looked in to during university studies) proving the benefits, these benefits should be made clear and really emphasise the point of retaining, and creating a range of green infrastructure		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Again, support the policy, but would like to know what provisions are being considered for maintenance of spaces and corridors in years to come. The policy would do well to refer to some kind of planning for this.		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy states that measures should be taken to ensure future maintenance of any landscaping scheme and green spaces	Consider whether some additional supporting text may be helpful	P.45 Final para of Policy wording. Add to final sentence '... agreement that provides for changes in design, planting or maintenance routines in line with the need to promote nature recovery and mitigate climate change.'		Yes
But not with fraudulent property developers like Redrow who despoil everything they touch		1 Not possible to address through NP	No evidence of fraud has been found				No
inspections need to be undertaken to ensure compliance with environmental legislation		1 Largely covered by the policy	LPA have the power to impose conditions and can require funding to assist with effective monitoring.				N/A
Page 45. Avoid use of word landscaping. Comprehensive landscape proposals...instead. What is required now is responsive environmental site planning and landscape design - landscaping is so old hat - it implies superficial after thought of planting only.		1 Largely covered by the policy	The Quick read makes clear that planting and open spaces as part of any new housing or other development is important. It should be considered from the outset and done right.		P.45 Policy 1st para replace 'landscaping should be included to' with 'comprehensive landscape proposals should'		Yes

SFG13	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
'Map of Green Infrastructure Audit Sites', page 46 - It's not immediately clear how this map ties in to Policy SFG13. Again, the map appears to present very similar information to that on the map on page 40, so consider whether the two maps can be consolidated. / This very important map is very confusing/unclear e.g. green space within car parks in inaccurate. Map should be larger and refined. (Key is larger than symbol areas on plan) Key areas outlined black, plan areas colour. Distinguish between public/semi public/private. Accessibility? see notes pg 40. Clear concept/diagrammatic strategy plan required. Spaces, connections. Hinterland (the town is not an island) acknowledged. See Thame NP as best practice.	Dorset Council + 1	Issue to consider	Agree the map needs to be clearer (and relates more to Policy SFCL1)	Review maps	P.46 Remove map, accompanying text & key.	Map was P46 is being replaced by map in C&L plus a comprehensive version to be included in separate Audit document.	Yes
Green spaces and way to encourage walking and cycling so important please.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
The Neighbourhood Plan has identified the need for securing in advance, management and maintenance arrangements for any green space or biodiversity enhancements associated with new development.	Natural England	Supportive comment					N/A
I would like to see a much stronger requirement that will ensure that all developments allow adequate space for tree and hedge planting in order to create an attractive urban landscape that will enhance and sustain the essential rural character of the town. It will also provide shade reduce pollution and contribute towards reduced carbon foot prints	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Largely covered by the policy	The policy does meet these aims - all developments (for example the conversion of an existing building within the town centre) will have the opportunity to include tree and hedge planting.	Consider whether some additional supporting text may be helpful	P.45 Before Details, not in bold, insert 'Shaftesbury's distinctiveness comes from its place in the landscape and green spaces and corridors, trees and hedgerows within a development must integrate with the existing green infrastructure network across and beyond the town. Green infrastructure is vital to health and wellbeing. At the same time it is a crucial element of adapting to climate change and protecting and improving biodiversity. It provides wildlife habitat, routes for walking and cycling, space for food growing, enhanced regulation of the climate at a local scale, and contributes to flood water retention and reduced surface water runoff.	Additional evidence sources added: CSE Low-carbon neighbourhood planning / Centre for Sustainable Energy January 2018	Yes
There is no clear, single policy in the draft Shaftesbury NHP protecting and enhancing Shaftesbury's biodiversity from housing development permanent damage. (National and Local policies indicate that positive plans should be adopted to create, protect, enhance and manage networks of biodiversity.) Proposed Intention:- To increase biodiversity by maintaining and improving the conditions and habitat for flora and fauna and the corridors which link them. Proposed Policy:- Development proposal must ensure that local biodiversity will not be harmed either directly or indirectly. Where opportunities exist new habitats should be created to enhance the ecological network (incorporate bee bricks, bird boxes and edible planting in the housing development). In exceptional circumstances, where some impact is unavoidable, developers shall demonstrate that appropriate mitigation and/or compensation will be provided and will aim to achieve a net enhancement to biodiversity in Shaftesbury. Permission will not be supported if significant harm resulting from development cannot be avoided. Endorse the missing policies submitted in the SOSG submission. The protection and enhancement of flora and fauna was shown to have an overwhelming support in the Jan 2015 door to door survey. These important areas of protecting Biodiversity and Hedges/Walls/Trees have not been brought out in a succinct, strong policy. Biodiversity:- Development proposals must ensure that local biodiversity will not be harmed either directly or indirectly. Where opportunities exist habitats should be created to enhance the ecological network (incorporate bee bricks, bird boxes and edible tree planting in new developments). Hedges/Trees/Walls:- Development proposals will maintain the settlement pattern and character and.....reference SOSG submission	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Issue to consider	The policy (together with SFDH4) references the need to enhance biodiversity through green spaces where practical. However the supporting text could benefit from including further justification for this reflecting the Dorset Biodiversity Protocol.	Include cross-reference to Dorset Biodiversity Protocol and the need for a BMPE as a validation requirement			Yes
It is important to plant trees in car parks for instance and to allow everyone access to quiet green spaces. / Post it - Car park and trees provision, link in species (GI Audit)		2 Covered elsewhere	This is specifically referenced on pg 65 (relating to Policy SFDH4)				N/A
Prevent the unnecessary felling and removal of healthy trees and hedgerows throughout the town but especially in public green and open spaces and mandating the planting of indigenous species on a large scale throughout new developments and on barren existing public spaces (Amendment to policy SFG13 and project G13)		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy makes clear that existing mature trees, native hedgerows and green corridors should be retained and included within a landscaping scheme for all new developments				N/A
Appendix H - Local Tree Species should be titled "Trees Found Locally" Many of the trees mentioned are not indigenous to Britain, never mind this area. It would be worth perhaps italicising non-indigenous trees. We need to demonstrate we know what we are talking about. Discriminate between locally indigenous trees and useful landscape/garden trees. (which may or may not have good insect carrying capacities, for example, important to help aerial feeders – birds and bats). Horse Chestnut < disease potential? 5. add Oak and Sycamore – top insect hosts for birds above, and add all fruit trees 6. Trees for gardens – more fruit trees for eating		1 Issue to consider	Agree - check list with expert in relation to comments raised	Update as necessary		Has been checked and revisions suggested above	Yes

SFGI3	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
A Town Tree Map could show trees can help us mitigate and adapt to climate change. We will need to plant non-indigenous species – but we must not import them (diseases have come in this way).	1	Covered elsewhere	This is broadly covered under Project GI3 but could be made more explicit	Include strategic tree planting project (linked to Project GI3)			N/A
Energy saving and cost effective techniques in public open space management e.g. avoid use of herbicides, adapt maintainance regimes, avoid need to irrigate plants (use of drought tolerant species) (See 'The Dynamic Landscape') ed. Dunnett and Hitchmough)	1	Largely covered by the policy	The policy states that measures should be taken to ensure future maintenance of any landscaping scheme and green spaces	Consider whether some additional supporting text may be helpful		Have modified see Row 10 above	Yes
As picked up later in the document, tree planting is necessary, though must be appropriate. So many schemes in the past have been hastily implemented, the wrong species is planted and then people cutting them down when they are in their prime because of the effect on the view from the slopes.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
Around houses the increase in hard fencing and concomitant loss of hedges degrades the street scene, reduces pollution filtering and leaves creatures with nowhere to go... hedges are better for everyone and help against climate change.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
Missing Policy - Proposed Intention:- To safeguard the rural landscape setting of the village and its spatial qualities. Proposed Policy:- Development proposals will maintain the settlement pattern and character and 1) Development proposals which are likely to alter, remove or otherwise have a detrimental impact on trees, hedges and open spaces should be resisted. Such proposals should consider the likely impact on the amenity value of trees, hedges and open spaces and an assessment of their contribution to their immediate and wider setting should be included at the commencement of any development proposals. 2) All new development shall have regard to the spatial characteristics of the locality and shall secure adequate space and planting. Visually important open spaces between buildings and groups of buildings will be required to maintain an open aspect. 3. Changes to existing boundaries and the creation of new one shall reflect the streetscapes, material and heights of boundaries in the vicinity and be of high quality. Hedges are the preferred method of delineating boundaries. The omission of boundary fences, walls or hedges from new developments in order to create an 'open plan' environment shall be resisted.Open spaces between buildings should not be encroached up on if this would diminish the relationship of the built environment visually with the surrounding countryside or within Shaftesbury. Many gardens and other open areas contribute to the spatial characteristics and appearance of Shaftesbury as a historic, rural, market town.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Largely covered by the policy	Many of the points are covered by the policy. Rolling Vales are referred to in the introduction and there is also more about Landscape in the enhanced text accompanying the Slopes policy SFGI2	The landscape character is also broadly protected under LP Policy 4 - consider whether there needs to be additional mention of the Rolling Vale characteristics in the supporting text / policies		Yes	
Quick read	1				P.45 Quick read. Replace 2nd para with 'It's important to retain features like ponds, trees and hedgerows that are valuable for local wildlife and mitigate climate change. Suitable arrangements must be put in place so that it's clear who is responsible for maintenance.'	changed emphasis to reflect changes above. Updated	Yes
P41 Quick Read	1				P.41 Quick Read - Remove the 3rd paragraph: 'A plan for planting development is complete.'	This comment belongs with SFGI3	Yes

SFGI4	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
I live behind a field of natural outstanding beauty and the field right next to it is being built in.. please tell me how this is protecting this area! Give it a year from people moving in and it will no longer be beautiful! / Too late?		2 Not possible to address through NP	The plan cannot reverse previous decisions, but should be able to provide an appropriate framework for future decisions.				No
Why??? far more important issues		1 Issue to consider	Cranborne Chase AONB is only the 14th such area in the world to (now) be certified as having "exceptional starry skies" and is the first AONB in the country to be designated in its entirety.	Delete 'potential' as the dark skies status has now been confirmed by IDA	P.47 1st para delete 'potential'	Amended	Yes
Absolutely!		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Not possible / But will you adhere to this policy? Probably not! With such cavalier developers		2 Issue to consider	Although not all lighting may be subject to planning control, this policy allows controls to be put into place where possible.				No
Not only wildlife- bright artificial lighting affects the health of humans adversely. Lighting in St James' street is too bright and needs addressing now. I have a light on my house outside my bedroom window. My quality of sleep has been affected ever since. In spite of contact SSE not interested in addressing. / Can the lighting on St John's Hill be considered there is too much of it / some 'suburban' street lights might be shut off an hour earlier than at present / Opposed introduction of 'glaring lights' and inappropriate 'lampstand' street lights		4 Not possible to address through NP	Street lighting is a matter for the Highway Authority (Dorset Council) - although they have entered into a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract with SSE Enterprise Lighting.	Include liaison on street lighting within Project GI4			No
Modern lighting is intensive and actually, bright lights help burglars. / People coming in late or going out early should not have to do so in pitch darkness. The removal of street lights on the new estate is ridiculous. / road and pedestrian safety before dark skies. May need more street lighting - but can be subdued		3 Issue to consider	Whilst there are safety and security benefits from lighting, there are also wildlife, dark skies and energy efficiency measures to consider. This policy does not prohibit lighting but instead looks to ensure that the lighting that is put in place takes account of all these factors.		P.47 Move much of the text from the Quick Read and put it after the initial section (the part in bold) i.e. 'One of Cranborne Chase's' to the end. In the Quick read replace this with a new 2nd para: 'Maintaining dark skies is not about turning lights out; it's all about 'the right light, in the right place, at the right time'.'	Amended	Yes
The Councillors are pleased that there is a policy for "Dark Skies" as they place high importance on the fact we are in an AONB.	Donheads Parish Council	Supportive comment					N/A
Yes - Bravo		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Yes, but better "smart" street lighting needs to be utilised so it's not on at night but comes on at the right times morning and evening		1 Supportive comment					N/A
We need to have less light pollution		1 Supportive comment					N/A
The dark skies policy [p47] is welcomed; however, the CCT should be 3,000K and not 3,200K.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider	Noted	Amend policy to 3000K	P.47 at end of policy amend figure to '3000K'	Amended	Yes
The projects list could include a more specific project to a) ensure all new lighting is dark skies compliant and b) converting existing lighting to become dark skies compliant. The AONB would be happy to provide greater detail on both of those.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Issue to consider	Whilst (a) should be progressed through the policy, (b) could be included within Project GI4	Provide further detail within Project GI4	P.89 Enhancement of Dark Skies project : Replace title with 'Protection of our dark skies' and then replace the final para (starting People and Businesses) with 'By collaborating with Cranborne Chase AONB, ensure that people and businesses in Shaftesbury know how to convert existing lighting to become dark skies compliant, thereby reducing light pollution from their homes and workplaces.'		Yes
Dark Skies, lighting and run off in danger of impacting valley below to east.		1 Supportive comment					N/A

SFDH 1-7	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
	1		<i>Reconsider layout of this section to flow better and include more images</i>				Yes
Already past sell-by date. Too late to do anything useful / The Civic Society have badly and wilfully let down Shaftesbury as has the local authority / Agree in principle but find it a worry that wherever development begins these kind of principles can so easily be bypassed.	3	Not possible to address through NP	The Neighbourhood Plan can only influence proposals for development going forward				No
Except:- Not sure about taller building... SFDH3	1	Largely covered by the policy	The supporting text makes clear that taller buildings make more efficient use of land, but bulky and unimaginative designs will not be supported.	Typo in supporting text (importance)			Yes
but- much of existing street lighting is hidden and out if keeping- replace when possible	1	Largely covered by the policy	The Neighbourhood Plan can only influence proposals for development going forward				No
But who polices the developers? I.e. persimmon poor build quality. Will new houses be 1)holiday lets 2) buy to rent or 3) home owner- residential. 2nd home ownership is destroying our historic town. / SFDH2 But who checks builders adhere to building for life home quality mark and breem assessments.	2	Issue to consider	This was also raised under SFHE2	Consider including information on monitoring		See changes proposed under Policy SFHE2 re monitoring	Yes
But new developing should be mandatory sustainable and mild! and proper street lights to suit heritage points.	1	Largely covered by the policy					No
Areas like Bimport are not usually sought out by tourists - folly to look at street lighting etc down here and Enmore green etc. If you want a cohesive design you need to look at the 4 entrances to the town, the car parks and the ugliest town hall in Christendom, ensuring they have one message and Shaftesbury 'brand', welcoming, easy to navigate, informative.	1	Covered elsewhere	Good design is about more than tourism. See also projects Projects GI1 – 3 and CL3 – CL5				N/A
Traffic congestion is an issue but on street parking necessary for the sake of the high street business - take that away and all sorts of people will find it difficult to access the high street. the parking skills of drivers need to be looked into. given our town uses the Hovis advert as a main draw - where is the push to encourage cycles in the town and where to store them once in town? I cycle around town and find it difficult to park them safely, we get loads of cycling tourists, have all the 'cycle runs in town but the cyclists have nowhere to safely park bikes - they end up leaning them against shopfronts and getting entangled etc (I know this because I work in a shop that has had this issue). Rather than the electric car - why not push the bike?!	1	Covered elsewhere	Policy SFDH5	Consider whether cycle parking should also be referenced under Project CL5			Yes
St Johns Churchyard of historical interest	1	Covered elsewhere	Identified for protection as a Local Green Space				N/A
We are concerned that Policy SFDH6 and Policy SFDH7 may be overly restrictive when we are seeking consent to undertake maintenance/improvement works to our existing infrastructure. In response to development requirements, we may also need to construct new above ground infrastructure during the plan period. Infrastructure development and maintenance by utility companies by its nature needs to be functional and considerations such as security and health and safety must take precedence over appearance - there are often constraints on location (due to existing below ground infrastructure), materials (for example requirements to meet national security standards) and size/form (driven by operational requirements).	Wessex Water	Issue to consider	The policy is not overly prescriptive and refers to "detail typically found in traditional buildings of similar form and function." As such this is not likely to require inappropriate design on utility buildings, but does expect their appearance to use materials that are "appropriate to the building and its setting, and are durable and, where possible, local or recycled"			No further action required	No
Care should be taken not to produce pastiche designs of existing architecture. It is very rarely successful e.g. Poundbury. Modern contemporary design can enhance existing styles much better if it is sensitive to scale and context. / I've no problem with buildings from different ages being in amongst historical houses - it brings life to the area - but they have to be good examples of their type - they have to have something to say and add to the history of the environment. what is more detrimental in my opinion are 'twee' buildings and fake leaded windows to bizarre gift shops etc (i.e. Blackfoot gifts) that offer nothing to the environment and say something more about how the locals might want to live in a 'fairy-tale' idea of the past.	2	Largely covered by the policy	The plan makes clear that "whether the emphasis is on traditional or modern designs, one thing that should be consistent is the quality and attention to detail, that can make such a difference to how well a new development is integrated into the town."				No
Pg 64 - 1st bullet point - change landscaping to 'planned and designed' 5th bullet point - change uses to 'responds to' add a 8th bullet point - comprehensive green space hierarchy	1	Issue to consider	The existing text is considered to better reflect the Building for Life criteria			No further action required	No
SFDH2 - External spaces within new housing developments should comply with sustainability principles including the current 'SUDS Manual' trees in 'Townscape Guidelines' and 'residential landscape sustainability' manual.	1	Covered elsewhere	Policy SFGI3 deals with guidance for landscaping and includes providing opportunities for sustainable drainage				No

SFDH 1-7	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
SFDH2 - Need plan to define short 'glimpses' and longer inner and outward views vs long inward/outward viewpoints and their 'view cones'		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFGI2				N/A
Pg 65 second to last par - change landscaped to 'design and workmanship' relationship of public realm to function of spaces, traffic management etc.		1 Issue to consider	The existing text "Car parking areas should be landscaped with planting." is considered to be clearer			No further action required	No
P63 - SFDH1 – SFDH7 Full endorse aspiration to high quality of design, workmanship and materials and reinforcement of Local Distinctiveness.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
SFDH6: supporting text - change "roost" to "nests" or nesting sites with reference to birds. Also mention that swift bricks can be incorporated into the build.		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Amend text		Page 69 updated (middle column and last para) where bats and birds can nest. Swift bricks that are incorporated in to the build will be looked upon favourably.	Yes
SFDH7: Pantiles are not locally typical in this part of the country.		1 Issue to consider	This only refers to pantiles on single storey buildings and is referenced in the 2003 design guidance			No further action required	No
Page 49 column 3: -Jubilee Steps “restored in 1937 to celebrate the Silver Jubilee” - maybe insert “celebrate the 1935 Silver Jubilee”, as George V reigned from 1910, & died in 1936; otherwise it sounds as if he was alive and feting his jubilee in 1937. -Lord Stalbridge sold in 1918, not 1919. -“three Shaftesbury business owners. This is when the famous ‘Sale Of Shaftesbury’ happened” – delete and replace by “three prominent Shaftesbury residents. They then organised in 1919 the famous Sale of Shaftesbury”. Because Dr Harris was not a business owner, he was a medical doctor; and their sale was in 1919, though Stalbridge had initially sold in 1918.	Shaftesbury Historical Society	Issue to consider	Agree	Amend text		Page 50 updated (last column paragraph 3). Matthew Tagney to check. Where appropriatae to do so, text has been updated	Yes
Page 49, column 2: “centred around” should say “centred on” [because a centre is a point, not a ring], though “around” is becoming a widespread usage.	Shaftesbury Historical Society	Issue to consider	Agree	Amend text		Amended	Yes
Map/Plan required to show the historic core elements of the town - Castle, medieval town, Burh, Abbey etc... Subsequent development areas. SAMS - Spread/sprawl. Conservation areas boundaries. Historic/graded buildings.		1 Covered elsewhere	There is considerable detail on the historic elements provided in the Historic Towns Study				N/A
Correct Beech tree ave to sycamore avenue. with beech and pine woodland on park walk. / Page 49: Change 'beech tree avenue' to 'sycamore tree line'.....' It is notable for both the terrace and [mature line of sycamore trees] with exceptional views over the Blackmore Vale countryside.....' / Page 49 "It is notable for both the terrace and mature beech tree avenue....." CHANGE 'beech" to "sycamore" and "avenue" to 'line". Suggest " ".....and mature line of sycamore trees".	Shaftesbury Historical Society + 4	Issue to consider	Agree	Amend text		Amended	Yes
Hillside Park = St James Park.		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Amend text to clarify		Amended	Yes
Images of Gold Hill are international importance often used to epitomise England. Used in British Airways promotion of UK as well as Hovis fame.		1 Supportive comment					N/A
Add - hard surfacing lacks quality and co-ordination. So important, it is a mish-mash at present.		1 Covered elsewhere	This is picked up in the relevant area descriptions				N/A
No mention of characteristic stone walls - why?! these are crucial elements.		1 Covered elsewhere	This is picked up in the Layton Lane area descriptions	Also include reference to stone boundary walls in Policy SFGI3			N/A
53. ...ancient yew tree is of pre-christian time...add in St Johns Churchyard.		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Amend text to clarify		Amended	Yes
par 1 add - and views to the north from Castle Green.		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Amend text to clarify		Amended	Yes
54. Icons and Motifs? o/a chracteristics elements?		1 Comment not understood					N/A
55. 7th bullet point* to provide shelter, - improve the character of the area, create habitat, filter airborne pollution		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Amend text to refer to other environmental benefits (ie not just landsacping)		Amended	Yes
55. 10th bullet point* unco-ordinated mixture of surfaces and edging		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Insert additional text as suggested		Amended	Yes
55. 13th bullet point* where is swans car park?		1 Issue to consider	Agree this is not clear	Delete bullet point -nalso note reference to stone whitewashed in bullet 5 needs to be removed		Amended	Yes
57. *8th bullet point* Why identify loss of beech trees? Are they threatened? Anticipate Lidl development. Just state how significant they are along Christy's Lane and forming a crucial element in the townscape and roadside.		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Remove reference under issues and refer to extension under final bullet of key characteristics		Amended	Yes
58. par 3* Scheduled <i>Ancient</i> Monument.		1 Issue to consider	Historic England refer to scheduled monuments (ie no ancient)			No ancient exists within the context of ancient monument (on this page)	Yes

SFDH 1-7	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
58. Last par - add overly large properties in relation to their plots		1 Issue to consider	This is referenced in the design guidance - whilst it may not be possible to reduce their prevalence further intensificaiton could be resisted	Add "Large scale properties out of proportion with historic properties in the area. Further intensification should not be encouraged."		Amended	Yes
Ongoing replacement of hedge boundaries with concrete post and wooden fencing. Often dominating.		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFGI4				N/A
61 should read “ northern slopes below Enmore Green are formed of running greensand...” / is the last paragraph correct?		2 Issue to consider	This information was supplied by a local architect	Amend to reference northern slopes		Section 5.2.3 - BL to check	Yes
61. bullet point 9 - replace location with facility		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Amend to read community hub		Amended	Yes
55. Busses give off fewer fumes than cars, it's the law, also all Gillingham/Shafesbury/Gillingham services do a one way circuit round the town in an east west direction. No more than 10 busses go down the High Street between 9 and 5. 5 to Salisbury and 3 to Blandford, I added two for luck. / Strongly refute that two way bus flow is a major cause of congestion and fumes- there are 16 eastbound bus movements a day, compared to 28 westbound - more pollution is caused by delivery vehicles and drivers having to avoid illegally parked cars outside Boots.	Shaftesbury Civic Society + 2	Issue to consider	Remove reference to buses - the issue is with larger vehicles particularly at the pinch points	Change reference to		Amended	Yes
53. Agree Ambulance station is in ludicrous site - same comment for Police Station	Shaftesbury Civic Society + 1	Supportive comment					N/A
58. Layton Lane 3 para: Unclear whether fishponds can be accessed - change to 'can be viewed from Snakey Lane'.		3 Issue to consider	Agree	Amend accordingly		Amended	Yes
49. The date should be 1816 and not 1753: -Robert Dyneley didn't buy his Shaftesbury properties until 1808 [source: Thorne, History of Parliament, 1986, Boydell & Brewer – extracts online at “history of Parliament”; also Innes p57]; -Robert died in 1815 (source: Thorne) & his brother John sold to Rosebery by 1817 (source: Rosebery map is dated 1817), so the 1816 date would fit with JD disposing of Shaftesbury properties formerly owned by Robert. Suggest the text is changed to: "Robert Dyneley, Lord of the Manor, created Park Walk which was given to the town after his death in 1816." / Two further points on the gift of Park Walk: 1816, the date given by Chandler, still makes sense. I guess the only way to confirm it from a primary source would be to go to DHC. Chandler gives 2 references: the 2nd is Hopton in Dorset Proceedings for 1993, which can be consulted at GHM, but would not be a primary source; the 1st is Innes, but Innes does not mention 1816: she says Robert “gave” Park Walk, with no date, & that Robert died (no date), & John sold to Rosebery just before the 1818 election. it might be best to say the gift was from the Dyneley brothers, because if the gift was in 1816, it must be from John (not Robert): Robert left all his worldly goods to his brother John, in his short & simple will which was proved in August 1815, see photos attached. Robert died 6 March 1815 (source: Foster, Pedigrees of county families of Yorkshire, published London 1874, cited at Cambs Univ website CUHAGS.com) and was buried on 14 March 1815 at Eltham (photo of record attached), near where the family had a house (Bramhope Lodge, Charlton, named after their ancestral manor of Bramhope near Leeds). Incidentally in hunting (without success) for any online evidence of the gift taking place in 1816, I did find that though originating from a gentry family near Leeds, the Dyneley brothers were both London lawyers, with chambers at Field Court in Gray's Inn (details available if of any interest): so though Robert “lived part of his time at Castle Hill House” (Innes), he was a bit of a “DFL” (Down From London).	Shaftesbury Historical Society + 3	Issue to consider	Agree	Amend accordingly		Amended	Yes
Page 49 "Park Walk in Shaftesbury (to the south of the Shaftesbury Abbey ruins) is a locally listed park." The Abbey end of Park Walk is a Scheduled Monument - is this what is meant? Or its HER reference?		2 Issue to consider	It is locally listed by Dorset Gardens Trust in their 2014 publication "Dorset Gardens of National and Local Significance"	Consider whether the DGT guidance should be specifically referenced		add to end of sentence "by the Dorset Gardens Trust"	Yes
49. It is important to go back much further than Alfred – this place has been a hilltop settlement over thousands of years. “The history of Shaftesbury owes everything to its location on a promontory enjoying intervisibility with Glastonbury Tor, Hambledon Hill and other Neolithic and Iron Age sites. Alone amongst them and as a rarity in England, it has persisted as a town in part thanks to King Alfred....”		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Amend accordingly		Amended	Yes
50. final para – “ without sacrificing the special qualities of a place that has evolved over millennia.”		1 Issue to consider	This is covered by 'well over'			Amended	Yes
NB many hollow lanes lead up to the town – a measure of footfall (hooves too) to an ancient centre – safe place, pilgrimage focus (yew tree plus Abbey), market.		1 Issue to consider	Not considered to be of major relevance to the plan			Amended	Yes
54 – King Alfred's kitchen silhouetted against the winter sunset should not be described as an iconic view – please keep “iconic view” solely for Gold Hill - otherwise the word is degraded.		1 Issue to consider	This is an important view - whether or not it is described as iconic - but no-one else considered the description to be wrong			No further action required	No

SFDH 1-7	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Agree that the Post Office deserves special mention – it is probably the best consciously designed building in town. Welcome mention of The Great West Road and Shaftesbury's importance on the post route. The PO was built in time of dire austerity just post WWII....	1	Supportive comment					N/A
55 yes – painting greensand white, or any colour, really degrades the building and the street. Likewise the old Westminster brick and also later Gillingham brick.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
55 makeover of pavement and 'shared surfaces' 10+ years ago degraded the town hugely – and makes it dangerous underfoot and drivers do not respect the intention. Surfaces should be of good quality and design and where at all possible permeable.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
56 St James is a rare English example of a 'sub –urb' - it's integrity has already been breached in a few paces with cul de sacs – really important to hold the dev line to the south and west or we shall lose the continental feel of the high town and its 'underburg'.	1	Issue to consider	Agree reference to sub-urb status is appropriate			Amended	Yes
P56 Question of plastic windows generally degrading buildings (and not lasting as long as wooden ones)	1	Largely covered by the policy	Reference loss of period windows in non-listed buildings eroding the character of the conservation area.	Project - investigate whether Dorset Council would consider making an Article 4 direction to prohibit the use of plastic uPVC type windows and doors within the Conservation Area.		New project page inserted and Article 4 direction to be considered	Yes
57 Important to mention imperilled hedge between Tesco car park and Lidl development.	1	Covered elsewhere	While perhaps not such a key characteristic to require a specific mention it retention would be sought under Policy SFG14				N/A
57 Old council house areas are of their time and quite important – again being degraded by garden transformations to car parking as well as house changes plastic windows etc. Trees in streets need replanting and care.	1	Issue to consider	The buildings are not considered to merit locally important building and the generic guidance on design is adequate			No further action required	No
58 Art deco house with well-designed recent extension building on French Mill Lane plus fine birch tree. But many disappointing newish buildings further down the lane – all visible from Park Walk.	1	Not possible to address through NP	The Neighbourhood Plan can only influence proposals for development going forward - but the guidance provided is intended to ensure future changes are properly considered.				No
Blue Plaque houses should be locally important buildings	1	Issue to consider	We do not have a list of all the Blue Plaque properties but the list in the NP was checked by the Civic Society			No further action required	No
Shaftesbury Sandstone not Greensand	1	Issue to consider	Technically, it is green sandstone but abbreviated colloquially as Shaftesbury Greensand.	Check through plan and ensure all mentions of Shaftesbury Stone is as Shaftesbury Green Sandstone.		To be completed - plan amended	Yes
Arbitrary listing of houses should not be done with out discussing it with the homeowners! It is not always appropriate ref. St james	1	Issue to consider	Homeowners have now been directly consulted	Review list and remove any with objection		Homeowners letters sent 12 11. 10 properties removed from the appendix	Yes
New build and need for materials to be specific by % based on character zones	1	Issue to consider	This would be difficult to prescribe and enforce			No further action required	No
New development west/south facing - consider external shading	1	Largely covered by the policy	Policy SFDH3 - references maximising the potential benefits from sunlight and shading				N/A
Post it - Overlay G1 and G2 listed by colour and further layer locally important	1	Issue to consider	Agree	Consider updating maps for clarity		Update map with G1 and G2 layers listed by colour. Add on locally important layer ZM	Yes
SFDH4 - Improving biodiversity is integral to sustainable development, and biodiversity net gain is an approach to embed and demonstrate this and required by National Planning Policy. Central to this is the production of Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plans. Developers are required to ensure habitats for wildlife are enhanced and left in a measurably better state than they were pre-development. They must assess the type of habitat and condition before submitting plans, and demonstrate how they are improving biodiversity; this might include for example, creating green corridors and local nature spaces, planting native trees and hedgerows, provision of fruit trees, and provision of bat and bird boxes built into the fabric of the new builds. Under the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol new development on greenfield sites greater than 0.1 ha should be supported by a Biodiversity Mitigation Plan that has been approved by the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team.	Natural England	Largely covered by the policy	Policy SFG13 and SFDH4	Include further information in the supporting text to highlight the requirement for a BMEP	Section 4.4 include information point: "Before a planning application will be considered, Dorset Council will insist on a Biodiversity Appraisal and a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan if the site is 0.1ha or greater in size, where there are known protected species or important habitats / habitat features, or where the proposal involves changes to a rural barn."	Text amended	Yes

SFDH 1-7	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Suggest energy efficiency could be 'required' not just 'encouraged'. Also suggest that SFDH5 should be added to the 4th bullet point linking policies to climate change mitigation. (P.15 of the draft NP) / There is a missing policy - all future Shaftesbury housing developments must be designed and built to mitigate Climate Change. ie: All new developments within Shaftesbury should seek to achieve high standards of sustainability and in particular demonstrable in proposals on how design, construction and operation has sought to: 1. Reduce the use of fossil fuels; 2. Promote the efficient use of natural resources, the re-use and recycling of resources, and the production and consumption of renewable energy; 3. Adopt and facilitate the flexible development of low and zero energy through a range of technologies; 4. Adopt best practice urban drainage / Require all new developments to be built within accepted 'green' standards of construction using only sustainable and environmentally safe materials and methods, and make use of energy only from sustainable sources such as wind or solar, with all new developments include solar photovoltaic (PV) panels as standard.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group + 2	Largely covered by the policy	The Government is clear that energy efficiency in buildings is to be required through building regulations - and is currently consulting on how these are to be further updated to achieve zero-carbon. Other sustainability features are included in the various policies. The Examiner of Bridport's Plan reduced a number of their climate change requirements to 'encourage' as such requirements were considered unreasonable.	Update supporting text to SFDH2 and SFDH6 to reference current consultation and proposed interim standards	Add supporting text at end of section on 'High Quality Designs' to read: "In October 2019 the Government consulted on further changes to Building Regulations. Their proposed changes would mean all homes completed after 2025 would be future-proofed with low carbon heating and world-leading levels of energy efficiency. An interim standard is also proposed as soon as 2020, that would require a 20 - 31% reduction on emissions in the short term. So whilst it is not appropriate for this Neighbourhood Plan to set different standards, we clearly want to encourage developers to challenge themselves to delivering zero carbon designs sooner if at all possible." Also add to end of supporting text to SFDH6 on building styles and detailing "All of these considerations need to work alongside improvements in energy efficiency and our ambition for a zero carbon future." Amend second sentence of SFDH2 to read: "New dwellings are encouraged to exceed the target emission rates of the current Building Regulations in place at that time, and to achieve Building for Life..."	Text amended	Yes
Require all new developments are provided by developers with electric vehicle (EV) charging points as standard		1 Largely covered by the policy	The requirement for these as standard is proposed to be introduced via changes to building regulations	Make reference to Building Regulations in the supporting text			N/A
Our older housing stock may be better able to cope with some extremes of temperature than the substandard new houses being built here. More exacting demands need to be made on developers and people upgrading buildings for living and for working.		1 Not possible to address through NP	Such upgrades are likely to be subject to the increasingly stringent Building Regulations requirements				No
Our prominent position means we are open to winds with a fetch from the Caribbean (interrupted only by Golden Cap...). We do need to think seriously about the impact of high winds.		1 Issue to consider	A list of wind-tolerant trees is noted in the appendices. However more could be added re building design	Reference can be made under policy SFDH3 (which already references microclimates) re avoiding the creation of wind tunnels, and SFDH7 re robustness and provide explanation in the supporting text.	Add supporting text before SFDH3 to read "Given Shaftesbury's hilltop location the impact of wind on buildings and people also needs to be considered, in addition to the potential benefits in terms of orientation for sunlight and shade. In particular, the scale and orientation should avoid the creation of public areas that may act as wind tunnels. The resulting microclimates may also impact on the success or otherwise of any planting schemes." Add to end of supporting text to SFDH7 that reads "Care should be taken... " "In particular, consideration should be given the the prevailing wind direction (particularly on exposed sites) as well as how materials may react to strong sunlight (when orientated in a southerly direction)."	Text amended	Yes
We do have responsibility not to add to problems in the valleys below and we do need to hold water for plants and particularly trees up high on the greensand. Permeable surfaces should be detailed whenever possible. The old part of town once collected its roof run-off into dead wells – most have been filled in through complacency – are there any left? Can we revive the idea?		1 Issue to consider	Rainwater collection could be referenced in relation to building styles and detailing (SFDH6)	Consider including reference to rainwater harvesting and that this should be clearly shown on the plans. The "and / or" in the policy (local buildings and sustainability benefits) suggests that the consideration of one or the other would suffice, and therefore should be amended to "and"	Amend final sentences of para of supporting text starting "Meter boxes" to read "Consideration should also be given to supporting local wildlife and other opportunities to increase the environmental credentials of the buildings. For example, roof overhangs with exposed rafters offer the possibility of roosts for birds. Openings to roof spaces where bats can roost can be designed into the plans. Rainwater harvesting to reduce water consumption. It is important that these are shown in the plans rather than assuming that they can be added at a later stage." Replace 'and/or' in policy with 'and'	Text amended	Yes
SFDH2 Breeam is not relevant to the policies I have studied it.		1 Issue to consider	Breeam accreditation is an industry recognised standards for achieving more sustainable forms of building			No further action required	No
56 - typo on the second to last line in the third column. ("p" -> "of")	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree	Amend typo		Amended	Yes
65 Typo in the fourth line of the first column ("importance"-> "important")	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree	Amend typo		Amended	Yes

SFDH 1-7	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
66 Is there any evidence to support the assertion that parking bays need to be 2.8 metres wide – this is considerably wider than the UK average 2.4 metre wide bay. As the streets in the historic parts of Shaftesbury are narrow (laid out before the invention of the car), shouldn't the plan try to discourage larger cars? Again, consider how this fits in with the declaration of a 'climate emergency'.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Dorset Council guidance states that "The typical car parking space should measure 2.8m wide by 5.0m long." but that "The width can be reduced to 2.4m if a 0.4m clearance is available immediately adjacent to one side of the space."	Add '(unless there is a 0.4m clearance immediately to the side of the space, when the width can be reduced to 2.4m)'		Amended	Yes

SFDH8	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
SFDH8 Saxon is the tip of an iceberg, so much lost because of continuous settlement, reuse of stone etc – this place is much older - even more exciting and special.		1 Supportive comment		NB remove 'ancient' from "Scheduled Ancient Monuments"			Yes
A family member took there life in the field that is being built in! I really don't think any consideration has taken place as it will look like an eye sore!		1 Comment not understood					N/A
yes, but old artefacts should not prevent developments on sensible and sustainable locations		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy allows for the recording of the finds - the level of protection will depend on the significance of what may be found in line with national policy				No
Green Boxes in the street – worst is outside St Peters Church – what does a building have to do, how old etc to be important enough to stop this. It is disruptive to pavement use here too, especially on Market Day. Many of these boxes are “in the wrong place”		1 Not possible to address through NP	Utility infrastructure is subject to permitted development rights				No
Does this policy add anything that is currently missing to the Local Plan / National Policy? Clarify what is meant by an ‘archaeological assessment’ - presumably a desk-based one in the first instance.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Whilst there is clear protection of designated and undesignated heritage assets under existing policies, the main issue locally is the lack of knowledge and awareness (which may not be readily identified through a desk-based assessment)		No further action required		No
Can we really trust the local authority on this against the likes of Redrow and Persimmon?		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy would apply equally regardless of the developer.				No
Column 2: delete “3” before “Park Walk”. Replace hyphen by “and”. Insert “Abbey” before “fish ponds”. Proof-reading: “equipment that send” should read “that sends”.	Shaftesbury Historical Society	Issue to consider	Agree	Amend text	Amended		Yes
Does this need to say “shall be recommended to the planning authority by the town council”. Ditto with “procedures will be required”: it could say “recommended...” as before.	Shaftesbury Historical Society	Issue to consider	The plan is drafted to be used by the decision maker - so the wording is considered appropriate (and preferable to the alternative suggested).		No further action required		Yes

SFDH9	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
If there are any!		2 Largely covered by the policy	The buildings subject to this policy are identified on the map and described in the Appendix				No
It's not clear what benefit is delivered over existing conservation area status.		1 Largely covered by the policy	These buildings would be considered undesignated heritage assets in their own right as well as contributing to the character of the Conservation Area.				No
As long as they are (buildings) allowed to be used for commercial/practical purposes.		1 Largely covered by the policy	There is no restriction on usage applied by this policy				No
As with proposed LGS sites, have you identified and made contact with all the owners of the proposed locally listed buildings?	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	The homes owners will be consulted directly (in addition to the general publicity undertaken)		Homeowners mailed 12 11 2019	All contested properties removed from the local listing	Yes
pg 70 - locally important buildings are these shown on a map? if so cross ref		1 Issue to consider	Agree	Include cross-reference	Update map as per row 62 on DH1-7		Yes
Do not consider 29 Tanyard Lane should be on the local list		1 Issue to consider	Agree		Remove 29 Tanyard Lane from Appx I and Map		Yes

SFCL1	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
The draft NHP does not support Policy 18 for the provision of a new Community Hall (East of Shaftesbury) as specified in the s106 contractual agreement as well between Persimmon and North Dorset District Council (Community Hall/Allotments/Play Area. Many residents who moved into the East of Shaftesbury estate were promised amenities to be built close to their homes, this included a Hall, allotments and Play Areas. The draft NHP has omitted these reserved land areas which have been designated and reserved for the East of Shaftesbury residents. Object to any proposed re-direction of s106 funding from East of Shaftesbury to improving halls located in west. A formal bid for s106 contributions has been submitted from Maltings Residents Association for a Community Hall (with Play Area and Allotments) for East of Shaftesbury at Mampitts/Trinity Green, and clear evidence of need (further comments made on this point). The draft NHP needs to be amended to reflect the Local Plan 2016 Planning Policy 18 and the s106 contract and the Persimmon Master Plan, where the plans and s106 fund has been collected and allocated for extensive facilities to be located in the East of Shaftesbury.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group, Maltings Residents Association	Issue to consider	Project CL2 (Investigate the potential for improving existing venues) is not intended to override Project CL1 (research into community facility on eastern side of town)	Review wording for clarity - including what the S106 provides	Include information ie: A sum of £335,024 from developer contributions (section 106) has been allocated to a Neighbourhood Hall facility and/ or towards a central Community Hall which would serve the town as a whole. These funds are being held by Dorset Council for the benefit of Shaftesbury East residents. Consultation is planned as per project CL1. Persimmon Masterplan dates back to 2004. Further consultation will establish the current needs. The different options for a Hall emerged from the initial Enquiry by Design process for the Eastern Area Development, and is included in the Local Plan 2003, Policy SB11(ii), reading as 'On site provision of a Neighbourhood Hall and/or a financial contribution towards an off-site community hall which may serve the town as a whole. In 2014, Hall options featured as part of the wider Neighbourhood Plan consultation to provide guidance on which option to follow, and a facility to serve the town as a whole was the preferred option. So, the Cockram's Community Hall project was being supported, although that specific project is no longer going ahead for a number of reasons. The Neighbourhood Plan consultation in 2019 provides further feedback and insight into the potential development of existing community facilities. An application for Sect 106 funding was also received in March 2019 from the Maltings Residents Association for a Neighbourhood Hall in the Eastern Area Development.	Updated	Yes
More houses being built but still same amount of doctors schools shops etc.. well done planners!		1 Largely covered by the policy	The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing additional housing (the housing numbers were set in the Local Plan) Extensive consultation was undertaken with service providers, the details of which are in the appendices and background documents.				No
But it won't happen / Financial burden on Council Tax		2 Not possible to address through NP	The Neighbourhood Plan sets the policy basis for considering planning applications but it is down to landowners / developers what planning applications are submitted				No
We have a well established tennis coach who may leave due to lack of facilities - or the school's ability to maintain them. This would be huge pity for the opportunity it has provided hundreds of kids to learn tennis, keep fit and socialise at affordable prices either within school or privately		1 Issue to consider	The policy would not preclude further tennis facilities - however the NP could be more explicit about projects to address the shortfall in standards	Include project to develop a clearer list of sport and leisure facility requirements to prioritise S106 funding	Develop a further project CL6 - improve sports and leisure facility requirements: A total of £386,677 (as at October 2019) of Section 106 funds are being held by Dorset Council for Play Area, and facilities for the benefit of the residents of East Shaftesbury.	Project section updated	Yes
I still think Shaftesbury needs a big leisure centre with a large swimming pool. The A30 site would be an ideal location, forging links between east and west residents. / we don't not have enough sport and leisure facilities i.e. no badminton courts/tennis. We must keep the open air swimming pool.		2 Issue to consider	See above	See above	As above	As above	Yes
For younger children 14 plus		1 Issue to consider	See above	See above			Yes
The table shows not just Fields in Trust standards for accessible green spaces but also Natural England standard for natural/semi-natural space. It might be appropriate to provide more description of what's included in the rows of the table (from the notes to the Audit doc) and even a colour-coded map. The table needs updating anyway.		1 Largely covered by the policy	Check accuracy	Review descriptions for clarity and check table against GI audit	Work with GI group on amending the FiT table (Thursday 7th November)	Amended	Yes
But we are no longer a market town since the cattle market has closed.		1 Issue to consider	The street market however still exists - there are 17 markets that take place each month		15 monthly markets - amend	This nyumber is not quoted in the plan	No
Many of the existing community facilities are small, badly designed, poor in quality and have no specific parking - thus impacting their usefulness for the community and annoying the residences surrounding them. I've visited community areas that are created with the end user in mind, to encourage all types of people to come together and share facilities, without loss of aesthetics. This part of the consultation seems very wishy-washy and without any real direction. / Community hall provision in Shaftesbury is very poor, we have plenty of small venues, but nothing that can compare in functionality or size to say Fontmell Magna village hall. We are a town of 7,000+, they are a village of 700+.		2 Largely covered by the policy	The policy does not require facilities that are no longer suitable or viable to be retained providing that their loss is balanced by improvements elsewhere		CL2 project looks at investigating the potential for improving existing venues. This may include extending venue(s). The next steps will be dependant on the outcome of further research.	No further action required	No
It would be useful if it was clear which map is being referred to, include a clear key (if it is the map on page 75) and make clear which items on the map are covered by this policy.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree	Update maps and add cross-reference	Page 75 needs to be Policy SFCL1 leading on to the map on page 76. The map is being refined to EXCLUDE Services, Car Parks, Healthcare, Schools, Footpaths, Bridleways and bus stops. Therefore the map will only feature: allotments, community hall sites, pubs, community leisure, + pool (new)	Map updated and pages will be swopped	Yes

SFCL1	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
The library is significantly undersized (according to national guidelines) for the current population and any further increase in population will create pressure on use of resources and space. Policy SLCL1 does not prejudice further development of such facilities. This is welcomed.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree	Make reference to Dorset Council's support of improved library facilities	DORSET COUNCIL CULTURE STRATEGY - excerpt: A resilient infrastructure providing access to cultural and leisure opportunities • Culture is understood, valued and supported by the public, private and third sector and communities actively engage. • Collaborative frameworks and strategies are in place enabling a secure and resilient infrastructure for cultural provision. • Cultural organisations have diverse and relevant income streams and business methods. • Improved and sustainable access for everyone to participate in cultural activities within local communities. • Promotion and raising awareness of opportunities for cultural activity both as audience, participant and volunteer.	Update policy	Yes
page 77 - Title should be Shaftesbury Open Space Provision.	1	Issue to consider	Agree	Review wording for clarity	Amend title to Shaftesbury Open Space provision.	Amended	Yes
Is the cricket club more than 2,500m away? / The Cricket Club is 700m from the nearest house in Shaftesbury not 2500m away. This statement is inaccurate.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group + 1	Issue to consider	Distance is approx 1.2km from the parish boundary and 2km from the town centre.	Review wording for clarity	Amend cricket club distance. A30 allotments part within/ part outside the settlement boundary. Map is being updated and open space provision will be amended.	Fit Table amended + map updated	Yes
The Cricket Club, which is owned by Shaftesbury Town Council is 10 acres of land available for community use. This Club should be detailed in the NHP and included in the 6 Acre Standard calculation.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Not possible to address through NP	Whilst the cricket club is mentioned it does not lie within the NP area and therefore cannot be detailed in the NP				No
Allotments Sth of A30, which is owned by Shaftesbury Town, should be detailed in the NHP and included in the 6 Acre Standard calculation.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Issue to consider	The allotments should be available in 2020 but part lies outside the NP area	Review wording for clarity	A30 allotments part within/ part outside the settlement boundary. The map will be updated to show the allotment zone that lies within the settlement boundary.	Map updated	No
Many planning applications have been approved by the LPA on the basis of supplying 'off-site Play Area Contributions' and these contributions need to be added to the 6 Acre Standard calculation.	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Issue to consider	Given the issues raised it would be appropriate to include more information on this matter in the NP	Update plan (table) to reference provision to be delivered through existing S106 funds	Section 106 funds (see table) section 3,4,6 and 7 relate to contributions made to manage off site play areas. I would suggest this is managed with the Mampitts consultation to understand what the residents want/ need for the areas that are due to be transferred.	Project CL 1 and CL7 updated to reflect S106 contributions	Yes
pg. 75 map unclear too much info. - shows existing audit assets only. Show proposed - committed e.g. E development Community Centre - proposed/deisable	1	Issue to consider	Agree	Revise map to clarify and include land to be transferred for community use	Update map to include the areas due to be transferred. Remove car parks, healthcare, footpath/ bridle path and separate zone to include the same categories as the Shaftesbury Open Space provision. Add in the land that is due for transfer by the developer.	Map updated	Yes
Post it - The pool is fantastic - can it run till later in year like Tisbury	1	Not possible to address through NP	This is not a matter that would require planning consent and therefore is outside the scope of this plan - there is nothing in the plan that would preclude this.				No
Encourage the provision of more allotments and promoting the cultivation of home-grown food (Extension of policy SFCL1)	1	Largely covered by the policy	The plan highlights the need for further provision, to be sought through new developments and also supported otherwise		The A30 allotments are scheduled for completion in late 2020 and it is expected that there will be an additional 22 plots	Map updated	Yes
p92 it repeats 'fortunate to have' which should be removed if possible.	Abbey School	Issue to consider	Agree	Review text to remove duplication	Transfer this to the schedule of changes for AH	Amended	Yes
P91- If we seek Westminster Hospital to be an asset of Community Value does the hospital; have to stay on this site; again the A30 could offer a better location (as Moreton in the Marsh)	1	Issue to consider	The policy is perhaps not as clear as it could be in terms of its scope and flexibility to consider alternative community uses as a benefit.	Consider clarification of wording to cover community education and health-related uses and possibel changes to alternative community uses that would be of benefit.	Middle column - third paragraph. Provide detailed update regarding The Westminster Memorial Hospital including that it was successfully registered as an asset of community value in May 2019. The Dorset HealthCare University NHS Foundation Trust are the current occupiers of the site. Much wider discussions are taking place with the local NHS Reference group in terms of future longer-term changes. Recent communication suggested it is important to evolve the thinking about how services will be developed and delivered in the future. This will be necessary to shape the longer-term plan for facilities. The future models of care delivery have to be much more focused on personal responsibility for health, care being provided closer to home, and capitalising on the strengths of local communities whilst at the same time consolidating specialist skills in fewer centres. Further future considerations for use via a Community Land Trust (CLT) could be (give examples)	Rewording needed - updated	Yes
Affordable housing of no interest? Is it so fraudulent developers can make even more!	1	Comment not understood					N/A
Map of community facilities, page 75 - The final item in the key 'bus stops' appears to be a line, and therefore do you mean 'bus routes'? In any case, they are very hard to identify on the map.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Map to be simplified	Remove bus routes from the map	Add in Armoury Yard Army Cadets hall to the utilisation report. Approx 1000 sq. ft and 2 sessions pw. Amend appendix G and page 73 needs to reflect 118 groups operate from 18 different venues	Updated	Yes

SFCL2	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Why? What is there apart from a hill popular from a bread advert showing a poor standard of living from the past century, and an abbey.		1 Covered elsewhere	The introduction to this section on pg 73 explains the importance of the tourism industry to the local economy.				N/A
No holiday inns or Travelodge's welcome here.		1 Not possible to address through NP	The plan can only influence the land use (eg hotel) and not the site owners / managers (such as whether it is an independently run boutique hotel or a travellodge)				No
Again, a bland section that doesn't really outline the issues we have with tourism in the town. I work in town at weekends and have lots of interaction with tourists who ask the same things over and over and over: why are you the only shop open, where is gold hill, is there anything else other than the high street, what's that building in the car park? could I use your loo? Tourists are poorly served in the town, and it's noticeable when they don't come here - our business takes a severe downturn.		1 Covered elsewhere	The NP identifies a number of projects such as Project CL3 - Improve signposting to key tourist facilities which were highlighted through the research.				N/A
Dangerous to set out to attract tourist (though it has its place) we don't want Shaftesbury to be just a 'tourist town'.		1 Covered elsewhere	There are a lot of other policies that deal with other matters such as design and employment.				N/A
Free car parking in centre of town		1 Covered elsewhere	Project TC4 - Managing congestion and parking demand includes the consideration of pricing structures				N/A
hotel on A30 and restaurant		1 Covered elsewhere	The A30 site is identified as it is an existing site allocation for employment - see comments under SFHE3				N/A
If accompanied by more parking, including for coaches, not intruding on the historic centre.		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy requires that such facilities are readily accessible by sustainable modes of transport (a travel plan is likely to be required in most cases).				No
Not sure if footpaths add anything to this map.		1 Largely covered by the policy	Agree	Simplify map			Yes
The policy protects 'key tourist facilities' which the text above identifies. However surprising that the Royal Chase Hotel wasn't listed as a 'main hotel'.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	The hotel is identified on the map	Refer to the hotel in the supporting text	Also add in the Retreat B&B to the map. Add the Royal Chase into the supporting text AH	Map updated + text updated	Yes
Should the policy refer to the map on the following page (page 79).	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree	Consider cross-reference to map	Link the map to the policy - map has been simplified to include hotels, pubs , tourist attractions, ref to the AONB, footpaths	Map updated updated	Yes
The tourist economy seems fine as it is and our local tourist centre is a great asset to tourists and local people.		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy is a supportive one to the existing industry but recognises that there is scope for economic growth within this sector.				No
In a sustainable manner		1 Largely covered by the policy	Sustainability issues (such as travel) are considered in this and other policies.				No
The ancient storage caves should have been preserved and developed for the good of the town.		1 Covered elsewhere	Whilst the plan cannot reverse past decisions, this issue is reflected in Policy SFDH8				N/A
pedestrianisation, more car parking or more signage for walking and cycling. 20mph speed limit in the inner town.		1 Covered elsewhere	Policy SFTC1 includes "create a safe and pedestrian friendly public spaces" - and SFTC4 refers to parking. Project CL4 deals with signposting improvements.				N/A
Type of development really crucial here. N.b. noise? Access?		1 Largely covered by the policy	The policy includes consideration of travel and also the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties				No
Community & Leisure P79 Map of tourism related activities – this needs much more e.g. cafes, street market area, High Street, Abbey and Town Museums, St Peters church, view points, green slopes, treed walks, And a “see also” ref to walks/cycle routes and future vehicle electricity top up places		1 Covered elsewhere	Most of these (views etc) are covered under other policies	Review map to check all relevant attractions shown - cafes have not been included as they are not considered a key tourist facility and are suitably covered by the town centre policy. There are various markets and the areas vary in size, and are generically covered by the Local Plan policy. The museums and TIC are already mentioned and mapped.	No further action required		No
Not Visible?		1 Comment not understood					N/A

SFCL3	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
please don't lump pedestrians and cyclists together! from bitter experience it's an accident waiting to happen.	1	Issue to consider	Whilst it is accepted that segregated provision is to be preferred, this is not always possible in an already built-up area.	Consider clarifying in the text that segregated provision is preferred.	No further action required	The text refers to safe walking and cycling routes. The text does not refer to shared routes.	No
Plenty of unused cycle tracks already.	1	Issue to consider	The route has been developed in close consultation with the main user group who have not raised this as an issue		No further action required	There are no dedicated traffic free cycle routes listed for Shaftesbury	No
And it's important that developers include these in their plans - which will require the setting a side of sufficient space.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
Desist using the car if one lives in Shaftesbury.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
Could we already improve on the map of what is proposed along the lines of recent discussions in the town so that future development may enhance what is offered?	1	Issue to consider	The route has been developed in close consultation with the main user group - additional routes may be identified through a future project	Include additional project re expanding the cycle network to include links into adjoining parishes within the hinterland	Appendix D updated to reflect new CL6 project.	This work is underway and the routes outside the settlement boundary are being mapped and will be included in a future project SFCL7 - 71% of residents felt there is a need to improve cyclepath and footpath networks which link to town and villages across North Dorset	Yes
Walk ways should be made more apparent, with signage, don't assume we all know the area we live in. Would be nice to know where you can go for long country walks	1	Covered elsewhere	Project CL4 ref improve signposting				Yes
Does this policy need to refer to either of the maps on pages 81 and 82?	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Agree	Include cross-reference to maps	map on p81 and 82 - looking at condensing the maps so layer one is exiting network and layer 2 is the proposal	map on p81 and 82 - looking at condensing the maps so layer one is exiting network and layer 2 is the proposal	Yes
It's good to see this policy in the Draft Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan but its location in the documentation suggest that cycling and walking are leisure pursuits whereas cycling is a viable alternative to the car for short everyday trips. This will be especially so as the cycle network is developed.	Dorset Council	Covered elsewhere	The provision of cycle routes is also referenced under Policy SFHE2	Consider adding cross-references between these sections		Link in to policy TC 4 - CL policy 3 sets out to achieve safe walking and cycling routes that are well connected with the town centre (reference on p23). Policy HE2 on p30 references cycle routes/ cycle friendly streets	Yes
Map of proposed network of footpaths and cycle routes, page 82 •Cycleway between the Royal Chase to Ivy Cross Roundabouts. This will be a north – south “spinal” off-road link with existing pedestrian light controlled crossings upgraded to toucan crossings where applicable. This may include improvements to side road junctions. This will enable better east – west cycleway links to be added. •Cycleway between Ivy Cross Roundabout and The Wincombe Centre/Littledown. •Cycleway extended along the north side of the A30 between Pixmead Gardens and Allen Road with existing pedestrian light controlled crossings upgraded to Toucan Crossings. This will include a cycle link to the proposed Persimmon Development to the south of the A30 via an upgrade toucan crossing.	Dorset Council	Issue to consider	Brie to liaise with officer and check against proposals	????		The Cycle Officer at DC met with BL on 31/10. This is the first time there has been insight in to the county plans for cycleway improvements. NP route is circular. The highways improvements will compliment the route and the officer is engaged and on board with the NP proposed route. Sustrans engaged to test the route with the local cycle experts. Date TBC	Yes
Footpaths around the town are very poor with few safe crossing places and disability access is limited. Traffic is dangerous in the centre.	1	Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP				No
We need safe and pleasant to use footpaths and cycle routes - including down the A350 from the North side of Town. Plus this should be 30mph (not 40) I use my car every time as there is no incentive to get my bike out!	1	Issue to consider	Brie to liaise with group and check against proposals	????	BL to action - indicative plans on the cyclemap to be shown? JW to confirm?	Future Highways plans include a cycleway from Littledown to North side of Town. Options being explored by Highways. Traffic studie and pedestrian studies have been undertaken along the Grosvenor Road. These indicate average speeds of about 35mph and AADT of about 11,000 (2018/19).	Yes
Impose 20 mph limits to the whole of Shaftesbury to protect the verges.	1	Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP				No
I agree with the proposed cycle route to facilitate cycling. There are sections that require greater separation from motor vehicles if cyclists are to be encouraged and feel safe.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
Signage - the proposed cycle route has an unsafe section on the A30 and needs to be re-thought	1	Issue to consider	The policy would help negotiate funding towards improvements to make this section safer		No further action required - just check the A30 patch	The route has been tested. There is a section relating to access ownership on a narrow strip of land adjacent to the A30 that needs investigating.	Yes

SFCL3	Respondent (number / organisations)	Category	Notes	Issues for consideration / change?	Draft documents/ actions required	Additional information	Plan updated Yes or No
Feel this essential especially with regard to safe access to schools. N.b. St James' School.	1	Supportive comment					No
pg 81 - enlarge map. Where is Dorset CC strategic cycleway network (it exists with monies attached) - national cycle routes?	1	Largely covered by the policy	The Sustrans route is within the routes shown on the map, running from the Motcombe road south-west through Bimport / St Johns Road onto the B3091		Update the map to include Breach Common	Cycle map needs to be amended for route to pass through Breach Common (currently running through Alcester). Check the map with JW versus the Dc travel plan map (no up to date version). Awaiting verification from Sustrans re cycleway validation/ signage options / development of local route	Yes
Pg 82 - designated Cycle routes (national) - names pedestrian paths i.e. Hardy Way, White Hart Link. Dorset County Councils - Strategic Cycle Way. Who has generated the demand for circuit cycleway? Realistic? Very difficult to 'retro-fit' and constraints of steep slopes. Proposed f.p links exist along Frenchmill lane e.g. Map requires refinement	1	Issue to consider	The route has been developed in close consultation with the main user group - additional routes may be identified through a future project		No further action required - already being featured in new project	Link to new project CL6.	Yes
Footpath Hardy's Way from Bimport to Enmore Green. Unsafe in parts plus barbed wire fencing. Footpath for end of Sally Kings lane, often overgrown near by-pass, crossing quite dangerous. Alternative crossing on foot (but not in Vehicle) would be Well Lane - also dangerous but less so. 40 mph limit in both directions would make By-Pass safer.	2	Covered elsewhere	Project CL5 - in addition, existing problems can be reported via https://mapping.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/rightsofway/reportproblem				Yes
Post it - A new path on the edge of the scarp where the Redrow development is taking place (proposed in blue) would be a huge asset, as it would join up a path coming up for Kingsettle Wood with another going down to Motcombe Road at the Penbury Estate.	1	Supportive comment					N/A
Transport Appendix - good assessment of traffic issues – but no mention of need for pelican crossing on A350 by Tollgate Park – essential with Redrow development - otherwise no safe walking route to school	Shaftesbury Transport Forum	Issue to consider	The cycle and pedestrian requirements for that particular development have all been finalised as part of that planning application which predates the NP		No further action required - already being featured in new project	No further action. Cycleway plans in place.	No
We support the policies for attractive walking and cycling routes linking the town centre with residential and employment areas, and improvements to existing path/ PROW networks providing access to the countryside.	Natural England	Supportive comment					N/A
As there is considerable interaction between Shaftesbury and this AONB the NP could include a policy / project to direct CIL funds towards AONB Management Plan aims and policies. For example, increasing access to and engagement with the countryside is becoming increasingly recognised as good for physical and mental health.	Cranborne Chase AONB	Covered elsewhere	Whilst at the current time there is no CIL in place for the North Dorset Area, Project CL5 would help achieve this aim				No
(Synopsis of comments): Identify and map the main strategic corridors with potential for enabling pedestrians and cyclists to travel within the town and out to the countryside. Improve signage for these routes. Ensure the routes are maintained. Identify specific opportunities for increasing biodiversity, tree planting, and amenity - including appreciation of the area's cultural and historic importance. (NB further details on paths and signage included)	Shaftesbury Open Spaces Group	Covered elsewhere	See Projects CL3 – CL5			Work is underway and additional CL6 policy is being developed to link Footpath and cycle network to adjoining towns/ villages and hinterland	Yes
footpaths wrong		Comment not understood					N/A
Not Visible		Comment not understood					N/A
Post it - Proposed cycle route bit on A30 needs a designated lane		Not possible to address through NP	Traffic management is largely outside the scope of a NP				No
Post it - Safer cycling would be great		Supportive comment					N/A