

Options Consultation Responses (71 received)

Comment: "General: consultation methodology. The timing of the consultation with one week between the presentation at the Village Hall and the deadline for comments of 25th March has been especially unfortunate as two key owners particularly affected by Site 20 (No 1 and 2 The Mead) have been away and presumably unable to contribute. As a related issue, there are rented houses in the village. A tenant at the end of a lease may have taken no interest in the consultation, while a temporarily absent landlord would be directly affected. Posters in the village and a notice in the Gossip Tree would be unlikely to alert the landlord." #(see 6.2 comment; also 6.4)

Introduction - Have we got the Vision and Objectives broadly right?

61 Yes, 2 No, 8 not completed.

Comments:

"Very comprehensive. Many thanks for all your hard work."

"The objective appears to be to build 26 homes in FM by 2031 – do they really need to be built as one large suburban housing estate?"

"A priority should be ensuring that Fontmell Magna does not, in the future, 'run in' to Sutton Waldron. At the present time, there are only four fields (one of them very small) that separate the two villages. As there are alternatives it seems unfortunate to 'straggle' the village southwards along the A350. Access to Site 20 would necessitate a roundabout rather than traffic lights; this might be an expense too far and in any case perhaps not feasible on this A road in which case there would be significant environmental deterioration (in terms of noise and fumes) from an already very busy road if traffic were to stop at lights and then move on from a halt." *(see 6.1)

Green Spaces

Summary: Respondents were in favour of all NPG proposals by a large majority, and 41 even offered help to create a new footpath. Most were happy with the proposed local green spaces, though the school playing field could also be included. Potential wildlife corridors were more contentious with only just over 55% thinking that NPG had included all corridors. Infilling was the next most contentious issue, but still with a large majority against.

1.1 The assessments for all the sites are available to view – are you satisfied with the detailed way we have carried out the assessments?

65 Yes, 4 No, 2 not completed.

Comment:

"1.1 claims that **all** the sites were assessed. The school football pitch was also proposed and as a recreation field was clearly eligible. The detailed assessments actually presented seem fair enough. Green spaces should be properly managed if they are to benefit the village. E.g. *Leylandia* conifers planted on their boundary should not be allowed to grow unchecked and impact neighbours."

1.2 Are you happy for the proposed Local Green Spaces (listed below) to be submitted to North Dorset District Council?

58 Yes, 5 No, 8 not completed.

Comments:

"The school playing field should be made a LGS so as to maintain open space between developments site 20 & existing West Street."

"Add school playing field (which has conditions applying)."

2.1 Are you in favour of maintaining the existing pattern of open spaces between developments?

69 Yes, 2 No.

Comments:

"Add school playing field (which has conditions applying)."

"Need to add more."

2.2 Are you in favour of infilling the green spaces to create a denser village pattern?

6 Yes, 54 No, 11 not completed.

Comment:

"Need to become a bigger village not a fuller village."

3.1 Do you support the proposals we have made (for wildlife corridors)?

67 Yes, 1 No, 1 don't know, 2 not completed.

Comment:

"Yes, but there doesn't seem to be very many – could do with a few more esp. south side of FM."

3.2 Have we missed any other potential wildlife corridors which should be considered?

17 Yes, 39 No, 4 don't know, 11 not completed.

Comments:

"1. Field & river bank to west of church, 2. Fields to south of village."

"Area south of village hall used by birds pre- and post-roosting."

"Field behind village hall (W8)."

"Along Gupples Lane in Hartgrove."

"Land between Glyn Gift Cottage & Springside due to age of important Oak & Ash trees nearby waterways, lack of agricultural management & wild flowers."

"New to the village so no meaningful comment to make."

"Fontmell Hollow track; sunken lane past Scallow Cottage to Jerry's Hole."

"Fontmell Hollow pathway past Scallow Cottage."

"Field to west of church to paddock at Middle Farm. To site 12 land north of Mill Street."

"Consideration for where the wildlife would go at the proposed development sites."

"Site 24 – marshy land that attracts varied birdlife including owls and hares & provides a green open space."

"The term Wildlife 'Corridors' is confusing. What does it mean in terms of Brookman's [Brookland] Wood, once an agricultural field and Fontmell Brook which has always existed? Wildlife does not know these 'wildlife corridors' and is just as prevalent in other agricultural areas apart from water birds and fish!"

"Footpath & lane from West Street to A350."

"Some, but not all, footpaths are also wildlife corridors: e.g. from Scallow Cottage up the sunken lane or to Springhead, but not the path across the field to the south of the latter. Note that properly managed farm hedges are not static entities but dynamic habitats, steadily changing in a cycle from one laying to the next. There are good examples in the village, contrasting markedly with other hedges that have been neglected or repeatedly trimmed into terminal decline."

"Field which village hall backs on to – designated as 'Possible Recreation Area' on development map – used a lot by migrating birds."

"Field designated as 'possible recreation area' in site 24 - carry overhead electricity cables which are used for perching by large numbers of birds at certain times."

4.1 Are you in favour of a new footpath from the permissive path by Fontmell Brook to Elbury View if the necessary permissions can be obtained?

68 Yes, 3 No.

Comment:

"This would detract from the character of the village and make it feel more suburban."

4.2 Are you in favour of a new footpath by Collyer's Brook from Middle Mill dam to Springhead if the necessary permissions can be obtained?

68 Yes, 0 No, 2 Yes & No, 1 not completed.

Comments:

"So long as it keeps a rural feel."

"This proposal would have benefits for road safety but at the expense of greater disturbance to the wildlife of Collyer's Brook pond."

"Would prefer extension to millennium wood." (x 2)

4.3 Would you use these paths?

58 Yes, 8 No, 5 not completed.

Comment:

"It is more important to have a pavement or a footpath along the A350."

4.4 Would you be prepared to help create them (e.g. fencing, laying chippings etc.)?

41 Yes (incl. 1, if capable), 24 No, 2 possible, 4 not completed.

4.5 Would you be in favour of a route bringing walkers closer to the village core (e.g. White Hart Link)?

62 Yes, 5 No, 4 not completed.

Comment:

"You do not mention that national cycle trail No. 253 runs through Fontmell Magna. This also brings cyclists to the village & horse riders."

5.1 Are you content for a conservation area appraisal to be carried out within our own resources, and therefore at minimal cost?

66 Yes, 2 No, 3 not completed.

Comments:

"Would suggest close involvement with NDDC Conservation Officer & Planning Policy."

"Unsure if I understand this."

"It should be carried out by an independent 3rd party, with no connection to the village."

"Would prefer an independent appraisal."

Housing

Summary: Respondents were in favour of the policies and issues identified by NPG by a large majority. There was strong support for site 20 as the preferred option, even if the density was higher than suggested by NPG, and drainage was identified as being important. There was significant opposition to the development of both site 24 and site 1. This leaves site 22 as the preferred second choice (as long as a road can be constructed from site 20?).

6.1 Do you agree with the housing policies?

61 Yes, 2 No, 8 not completed.

Comments:

"Too prescriptive."

"There needs to be more emphasis on using renewable energy technologies and creating energy efficient, well insulated homes using future proof building methods but in keeping with the village vernacular".

"Yes, except keep houses to 25 max per site."

"Need to keep housing to max 20 per site."

"Would like to see addition of nursing home or similar."

6.2 Do you consider any of the above sites would be wholly unsuitable for development?

If YES, which of the four do you think should not be considered, and why?

21 Yes, 42 No, 2 Yes & No, 2 sort of, 4 not completed.

Comments:

"Not wholly unsuitable, generally unsuitable. Site 1 would add traffic to West Street."

"Site 24 Additional housing would increase danger of flooding as shown on map."

"Site 24 would fail to maintain space between developments and increase traffic on West Street."

"Site 24 intrudes into open fields."

"Site 24 on its own would be a problem with access."

"East end of 24 due to drainage & appearance but west end excellent."

"24. Lack of safe access without major upheavals to existing adjacent properties 1) existing properties suffer from flooding from rainwater run-off from field 2) overhead electricity cables would have to go."

"24 – using this site would create infilling, and would be better kept as a local green space or wildlife corridor."

"24 inappropriate as site 24 backs onto listed & other character properties and would obliterate the view over to Sutton Waldron."

"24 & 1 & 12."

"Site 12. A similar development to Collyer's Rise with separate entrance could be acceptable if well designed."

"Site 1 – too close to Brookland Wood, disturbs wildlife and peaceful walks, and obscures the lovely view from Village Hall, as does site 24. Clear aspect is lovely for weddings. Also, road is very busy now & narrow for more traffic."

"Site 1 – traffic in West Street is very bad already. Any increase would be dangerous and unacceptable. The school parking is a priority – somebody will be killed one day."

"Site 1 It's a fill in and busy for the village."

"Site 1 – increased traffic on West Street."

"Site 1 – impact on Brookland Wood & increased traffic on West Street."

"Site 20 the best by far."

"None are totally unsuitable but site 20 is the most practical & accessible & less likely to impinge on existing homes."

"I think Site 20 is unsuitable. In addition to the reasons already stated above* in the comments on the General Question further disadvantages are: This field is low lying and floods in places, not mentioned in your assessment. The properties already in this area, including those in The mead, already struggle with water problems when there is heavy rain. Surplus water drains into the field. If this site was to be developed the sewage system would need to be expanded as a necessity. Obviously, this would incur major expense. Some years ago, when the field of Site 20 was sold by the late owner of Home Farm, Margaret Helyar, I think there was a covenant relating to future development of the land. This would need to be checked (unless this has already been done)."

"Site 20 should not be considered if there is the slightest risk of it increasing serious existing problems relating to the high water table of nearby properties. If the site is selected because suitable drainage/sewerage can indeed be achieved for it, then the system installed should also be made available to such properties. At least one owner (and perhaps one further owner and a landlord) are believed to have lost the opportunity to comment on this key issue through temporary absence: see comment on methodology above." #

"Sites: 1, 24 & 22. Site 1 = Access on West Street, Sites 24 & 22 because of potential access to West Street & narrowing of gap between Sutton Waldron & FM. West Street cannot cope with current traffic volumes esp. at school times. There are also increasing problems caused by lorries & delivery vans using the road, therefore these issues would increase with any further development not to mention the disruption caused by building supplies."

"I consider Sites 1 and 24 would be wholly unsuitable for development because both would require access via West Street which is already overburdened with traffic. There would be a significant increase in the vibration and noise levels on a road that is already used as a 'rat run' and would pose increased danger to pedestrians, particularly school children on their way to and from the school. Additionally, it would bring about a negative impact on the listed buildings along West Street with the resultant detrimental effect on the character of this street in this core part of the village."

"Sites 1, 24 & 22 – I don't think any substantial development needing possible access to West Street should be considered."

"1, 22, 24 Poor Road."

"Access routes."

6.2 Do you consider that the Neighbourhood Plan group was wrong to discard any of the housing option sites?

8 Yes, 59 No, 4 not completed.

Comments:

"12."

"10.1 – it mentions that this will get planning permission but do not mention how many dwellings. Will the number of dwellings granted be deducted from the proposed 18-30? 35.1 & 35.2 – would appeal more to self-builders who would like to live in an edge of village location."

"Site 27 as there would be less impact on present houses/people. Keeping a village & not housing estates is top priority. Less houses in all locations would be best and certainly no more max. 20 in any one area absolutely essential. Also site 12 with a few houses would be fine."

"Site 12 appears to show prejudice and lack of even handed approach – should be retained as a possibility."

"Site 12 – I query how much of an impact on the strip Lynchetts site 12 would have as a considerable distance away; part of site 1 for lower density housing & not only considered for "beyond 2031" but now."

"I consider Site 12 should not have been discarded as an option because Mill Street has much lighter traffic and would have closer access to the A350. Additionally there are already a number of modern houses in the vicinity of Collyer's Rise and thus the character of this part of the village would not be so negatively affected."

6.3 If site 1 is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed?

66 Yes, 1 No, 4 not completed.

Comments:

"Increased traffic on West Street."

"Backs onto existing properties so inappropriate."

"A few houses would not impact greatly on West Street traffic. Sewage works shouldn't smell – other houses closer now."

"Unsuitable."

"If site 20 does comply with 2.5 'open spaces, etc.' then this site does too."

6.4 If site 20 is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed?

58 Yes, 7 No, 6 not completed.

Comments:

"This seems to be the best option."

"Is this not a footpath to Sutton Waldron?"

"Density needs to be kept low to keep max. no. of houses to 30 including allowance for school parking."

"Max 25 houses on any site."

"No more than max 20 houses per site essential i.e. no estates. Keep trees as now on north side."

"See 6.2 above." #

"The impact 46 houses will have on A350 traffic volume, which is already high; minimal bus service through village, meaning that anyone who lives there will need a car & families will likely have two (potentially 92 cars); can the school cope with more children?; the volume of houses will likely need street lighting which goes against 'Dark Skies' Policy Objective 2 b); can school and doctor's surgery cope with population increases?; development should include a car park for the school to ease congestion on West Street."

"Land drainage scheme and tree screening from A350 are essential requirements."

"Ensure North boundary hedge & trees preserved."

"Should not comply with 2.5 as open views & spaces are certainly enjoyed (as for site 1). There are considerable drainage/septic tank problems for nearby properties because of high water table & regularly low lying surface water."

"Would parents bother driving around the village to a new drop off point, or simply continue to park in West Street and use footpaths to rear of school?"

6.5 In relation to site 20:

49 said that achieving a new road access and parking and drop off facilities to rear of school is more important than keeping the number of houses low in line with local housing needs.

18 said that keeping the housing numbers low is more important than achieving a new road access and parking and drop off facilities to rear of school.

1 said both, 3 not completed.

Comments:

"Trees on north side need to be protected."

"A limit of 30 houses and road access & parking/drop off for school are essential."

"Add (c) – number low + drop off/parking for school."

6.6 In relation to site 20:

41 said that having the site developed with a higher than preferred density is more important than losing the site altogether.

27 said that keeping the housing numbers low is more important than the landowner withdrawing the site. Alternative sites given by these respondents were site 24 (8), site 22 (6), site 22/24 (1), site 1 (6), don't know (1), less houses on all sites or site 27 or west end of 24 or 12 (1), no preference (2), none because of traffic volume on West Street (2).

3 not completed.

Comments:

"Any competent developer's negotiator will seek to maximise profit by increasing the number of houses and reducing the infrastructure offered as *quid pro quo*. The assessment believes 30 houses to be in keeping with the existing character of the village: building too many will encourage newcomers and not reduce subsequent pressure on the other sites. Call the bluff."

"Don't think any are suitable due to access to West Street."

6.7 In relation to sites 1 and 20:

53 said that potentially new school parking facilities (site 20) is more important than the opportunity to include a new, larger, sewage treatment facility which may serve other properties in the village (site 1).

12 said that the opportunity to include a new, larger, sewage treatment facility which may serve other properties in the village (site 1) is more of a priority than potentially new school parking facilities (site 20).

5 not completed, 1 "both are needed!"

Comment:

"The Plan committee has appreciated that Site 1 presents an opportunity for better sewerage/drainage for existing villagers, but not that Site 20 (if feasible at all) could do likewise."

"No road linking A350 to West Street – it would become a 'rat run'."

6.8 If site 22 is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed?

62 Yes, 4 No, 1 don't know, 4 not completed.

Comments:

"Only viable if/when 20 has been developed."

“strain on school & doctor’s surgery with increased population; increased traffic on West Street & A350; noise disturbance to residents on West Street from ‘Recreation Area’; proposed community site causing financial loss to village hall, school hall & church; proposed employment site – more traffic on West Street etc.”

“This site could give needed employment in the village (as proposed).”

“Suitability of site for possible employment/community use means more traffic on West Street & possibly competition with existing community sites.”

“I dislike the idea of linked developments, too much development in one area.”

6.9 If site 24 is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed?

57 Yes, 7 No, 7 not completed.

Comments:

“If Objective 2 d) is desirable then this would not conform.”

“BUT these are historic matters like the ancient 5 ridge field system.”

“Site completely inappropriate as it backs onto listed & character properties.”

“West Street is an extremely busy road with the school & nursery & traffic (pretty fast) going through to Sturminster etc.”

“Although it would be opportune to make provision of school access and car parking a factor in choosing the new area for building I think it should not be the decisive factor. Development on Site 24 could really contribute to the attraction of Fontmell Magna as a village in terms of its proximity to and possible integration with the already excellent amenities area. This would mean that these facilities would be easily accessed by new residents of this site and would be a big attraction to families with children.”

“Only develop west end of 24 with less houses. Little impact on West Street traffic.”

“Unsuitable.”

“Can school & surgery cope with increased population?”

“Wildlife corridor – see 3.2. Surface water flooding significant problem at times.”

6.10 In relation to sites 22 and 24:

52 said that the sites should only be considered as part of a phased approach after a new road access is provided from site 20.

11 said that access would be acceptable off West Street for the level of housing proposed and likely traffic levels.

3 not completed, 3 said no to both, 2 said as per first comment below.

Comments:

“(a) and (b) cannot be answered sensibly without considering the impact of Site 1 as well.”

“No access shown on plan. We do not like the linking of one development to the next, it would just be one big estate.”

6.11 If there is no possibility of vehicular access to site 22 from site 20:

32 said that a road should be constructed to site 22 from near the surgery (via site 24). 22 said no, 10 not completed.

28 said site 22 should not be excluded in favour of all or part of site 24. 17 said it should. 19 not completed.

Comment:

“Where is access to site 24?”

36 said site 20 should not be excluded as a potential development site. 13 said it should, 15 not completed.

Comments:

“Keeping below 20 dwellings.”

“Perfect site.” [site 20]

7 not completed at all.

6.12 Of the four sites, please rank in your order of preference (1 being the most preferred, 4 being the least):

17 - 20, 22, 24, 1.

8 - 20, 1, 22, 24.

6 - 20, 24, 22, 1.

6 - 20, 22, 1, 24.

3 - 20, 1, 24, 22.

3 - 20, 24, 1, 22.

1 - 20, 22 & 24, 1.

1 - 20, 22.

1 - 20.

1 - 20 & 22 (1st), 24 & 1 (4th)

2 - 20 & 1 (1st), 22, 24

1 - 20, 22, 24 & 1 (joint 4th)

1 - 20, 24.

1 – 20, (1, 22 & 24 all rank
4th!)

2 - 24, 22, 20, 1.

1 – 24, 1, 22, 20.

1 – 22, 20, 24, 1.

1 – 22, 24, 20, 1.

4 – 1, 20, 24, 22.

1 – 1, 20, 22, 24.

9 not completed.

Comments:

“No one site is acceptable as all sites with less housing would be best thus keeping the village feel and not a housing estate. All building will impact on distant views so not an argument. Also, equal problem with settlement boundary in many sites.”

“Since the feasibility of 20 is uncertain, and the selection/rejection of one site impacts the others, a meaningful ranking is not yet possible.”

Site 20 was the most popular site, scoring 76 (where the least points possible is 62, the total of those who completed this question, where 1st rank = 1, 2nd rank = 2, etc. The maximum score is therefore 248). Site 22 scored 154, Site 24 scored 181 and Site 1 scored 190.

Original Message-----

From: "Diccon Carpendale" <Diccon.Carpendale@brimblelea.com>

Sent: Friday, April 7, 2017 6:54am

To: "np@fontmellmagnapc.co.uk" <np@fontmellmagnapc.co.uk>

Subject: Fontmell Magna Neighbourhood Plan Options Consultation

Dear Sir/Madam

I am instructed on behalf of Quintin Bull to respond to the Neighbourhood Plan Options Consultation.

Mr Bull put forward three sites for consideration identified by the Parish Council as 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3.

Site 10.1 is already within the Settlement Boundary and, as such, the PC has only considered (for the purposes of possible Neighbourhood Plan allocation) sites 10.2 and 10.3.

Q.6.2 of the consultation asks Do you consider that the Neighbourhood Plan group was wrong to discard any of the housing option sites? If YES, which ones should be reconsidered and why?

Please can the Neighbourhood Plan Group take into account the following observations with respect to both sites in answer to this question.

10.2 - Middle Farm Dutch Barn

The site includes a sizeable Dutch barn/hay store. This is not an attractive structure and detracts from the appearance of the Conservation Area and the character of the AONB. The site is "read" directly in conjunction with the existing group of (former) farm buildings at Middle Farm. Simply because this site (and many other buildings within the village) are visible from higher ground within the AONB should not preclude them from consideration for additional development.

The Neighbourhood Plan SEA has correctly identified the site has good proximity to facilities all of which are within a walking distance.

The main concern about views from the AONB can be addressed through appropriate built design and additional landscaping. The site is already substantially covered by the existing building and presents an ideal opportunity for visual enhancement improving the character of the AONB and the setting/appearance of the Conservation Area.

10.3 - Middle Farm Paddock

Similarly, the main concern (and apparent main reason for excluding this site) is potential views from the AONB. The site is well enclosed by existing hedges, trees and woodland. This can be supplemented and additional planting provided to enclose the site (visually).

The site has the potential to accommodate a number of (most likely) single storey properties that would be ideally suited for those retiring or wishing to downsize into a bungalow. It is known that there is significant demand for this type of accommodation.

A small development of single storey properties could be designed to have the appearance of a group of farm buildings (barns) echoing the characteristics of the adjoining former farmyard.

An appropriate low density development would safeguard the character, enhance the appearance of the area and enable it to be more of an asset to the community. At the moment despite its central location, it is difficult to see or appreciate the land in question. A modest development proposal could allow for appropriate management of existing and proposed new trees to create an extremely attractive feature (which is not currently appreciated).

Alternatively, the site could be given a more open/parkland feel with the planting of a number of specimen trees with a smaller number (one or two) dwellings carefully sited. Appropriate planting and long term maintenance of the area would be a dramatic enhancement to this part of the village. As with 10.2, this site is extremely well located close to the centre of the village and its various facilities.

Access to both sites would be via Collyer's Rise. There would be no vehicular access from either site onto the A350.

Both sites are centrally located and effectively infill or redevelopment of a site where there is an existing building. Development in this area will relate far better to the existing pattern and character of development and prevent the elongation/extension of the village out into open countryside associated with the sites that have been identified for further consideration. Such large scale expansion will be more intrusive when viewed from the AONB than modest infilling close to the village centre.

I would urge that both sites are given further careful thought recognising that they are very well located and with appropriate

design and landscaping can be sympathetically developed in a fashion which will safeguard the character of the AONB and enhance the appearance of the Conservation Area.

Should the FMNP Group wish to discuss either site further I would be very happy to meet with them at the appropriate time with a view to exploring how best both sites can be brought forward.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards.

Diccon Carpendale
Brimble, Lea & Partners
Wessex House
High Street
Gillingham
Dorset
SP8 4AG

Tel: 01747 823232

Fao: Jo Witherden / Dorset Planning Consultant Ltd
Re: DCC FRM SW & Floodrisk - Fontmell Magna NP options consultation
Our Ref: PPE17-016

Hello Jo

In reply to your enquiry of 20/03/2017, as submitted to DCC Planning. I apologise for our (FRM) delayed response;

I have reviewed the documents supplied that are relevant to our remit / involvement as statutory consultee for surface water management, associated with major development proposals (i.e. 10 dwellings / 1ha), and broader involvement in terms of flood investigation & regulation of Ordinary Watercourses (Land Drainage Consent - s23 Land Drainage Act), principally the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) document and Site Assessment sections of the main Neighbourhood Plan.

However I am bound to highlight that (fluvial) flood risk, associated with the relevant Main River channel (Fontmell Brook) and floodplain/s (Flood Zones 2 & 3), remain the remit of the Environment Agency (EA). Regulation of works in proximity to watercourses with Main River status, equally remains the remit of the EA, in accordance with the Water Resources Act and (Wessex) Byelaws legislation. Accordingly we offer the following site specific screening, input on documents supplied and generic comments based upon our role (DCC FRM).

SEA Document

Table 4 (page 11) - Relevant Plans, Programmes & Objectives / Soil, Water, Air & Climatic Factors
We acknowledge the reference to NPPF & DCC's Strategy, to the promotion of sustainable use of water, the steering of development away from areas of highest risk and application of sequential & exception tests, and reduction of vulnerability to climate change.

S7.1 - Main Issues

We acknowledge the reference to potential flood risk to new or existing development and increased runoff.

Site 1 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), but is shown by relevant mapping to be at some (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding (1:30/100/1000 year) and fluvial risk (Flood Zones 2 & 3 medium / high risk) in to the Main River channel (Fontmell Brook) which appears to form the northern boundary of the site. Any redevelopment proposals would need to consider this localised (prevailing) flood risk associated with the adjacent watercourse, and the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 9 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), but is shown by relevant mapping to be at some (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding (1:1000 year) with an overland flow path north-south, from an existing pond feature to an Ordinary Watercourse located outside and south of the site. Any redevelopment proposals would need to consider both the prevailing risk of surface water flooding, together with the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site10.2 - This brownfield / previously developed site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), and is not shown by relevant mapping to be at (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding. However any development proposals would need to consider the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 10.3 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), and is not shown by relevant mapping to be at (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding. The site is approximately 20/30m south of the Main River channel (Fontmell Brook). Any development proposals would need to consider the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 12 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), and is not shown by relevant mapping to be at (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding. The site is approximately 30/40m North of the Main River channel (Fontmell Brook). Both the southern site boundary and adjacent highway (Mill Street) are thought to be impacted by fluvial flood risk (Flood Zones 2 & 3 medium / high risk). Any development proposals would need to consider the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 20 - The brownfield / previously developed site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), and is not shown by relevant mapping to be at (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding. However any development proposals would need to consider the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 22 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), but is shown by relevant mapping to be at some (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding (1:100/1000 year) to the north / north-western boundary, adjoining Site 24. Any redevelopment proposals would need to consider both the prevailing risk of surface water flooding, together with the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 24 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), but is shown by relevant mapping to be at some (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding (1:100/1000 year) to the south and south-eastern boundary, adjoining West St. Any redevelopment proposals would need to consider both the prevailing risk of surface water flooding, together with the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 27 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), but is shown by relevant mapping to be at some (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding (1:100/1000 year) adjoining the south-western corner and West St. Any redevelopment proposals would need to consider both the prevailing risk of surface water flooding, together with the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 31.2 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), and is not shown by relevant mapping to be at (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding. However the site is close to / south of ongoing

flooding issues which are impacting upon existing properties, resulting from overland flows of runoff from agricultural land to the west. Any development proposals would need to consider both prevailing risk and the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 35.2 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), and is not shown by relevant mapping to be at (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding. However the site is adjacent to / immediately north of an area thought to be at risk during severe rainfall events (1:1000 year). Any development proposals would need to consider both prevailing risk and the management of surface water runoff generated by the site.

Site 46 - The site falls within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), but is shown by relevant mapping to be at (theoretical) risk of surface water flooding (1:30/100/1000 year) and fluvial risk associated with an Ordinary Watercourse, which appears to form the northern boundary of the site. Any redevelopment proposals would need to consider prevailing flood risk associated with the adjacent watercourse & overland flow through the western half of the site, together with the management of surface water runoff generated by the site itself.

Mitigation proposals, as set out within s9 and Detailed site assessment within Appendix A, should accord with the above and following generic considerations;

Generic Considerations: All development proposals, whether deemed major or non-major in nature / scale, must give appropriate consideration to both (any) prevailing flood risk and the management of surface water runoff generated by the site, and development proposals. Such consideration is a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), local planning policy and best practice. As relevant Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) we (DCC FRM) act as statutory planning consultee for surface water management associated with major development proposals. Accordingly all development proposals are to be supported by a site specific and deliverable strategy for surface water management. Having screened the Fontmell Magna NP area in terms of BGS mapping, and relevant ground conditions, the dominate bedrock type is variable. Bedrock ranges (west to east) from West Walton & Kimmeridge Clay, Greensand, Gault Mudstone, Limestone to Chalk, overlain by limited superficial deposits of river deposits of sand & gravel. On this basis potential infiltration rates and therefore possible use of soakaways will be viable, with infiltration more likely towards the east. Where potential infiltration is unlikely to match the required design standard (i.e. 1:100 year plus climate change uplift of 40%), alternative SuDS methodologies and techniques for regulating the discharge of surface water are to be considered within preliminary proposals, together with consideration of potential exceedance events.

Site Assessment Summary - Preferred Sites (1, 20, 22 & 24)

All site specific requirements and policies to accord with the screening offered above, and generic considerations with regard to surface water management.

Site Assessment Summary - Decision Matrix (9, 10.3, 12, 27, 35.1 (?), 35.2, 31.2 & 46)

As above. For consistency, all requirements and policies to accord with the screening offered by DCC, and generic considerations with regard to surface water management.

I trust that the above offers both the generic and site specific input that was sought. Please note that some of the sites identified will not qualify as major in terms of planning status and would not therefore be passed to us (DCC FRM) for formal consideration.

Should you require further clarification of the comments made above, please do not hesitate to contact either myself or one of my FRM colleagues.

Regards, Gary.

Gary Cleaver
Engineer
Flood Risk Management
Dorset County Council
County Hall, Colliton Park
Dorchester
Dorset
DT1 1XJ

Tel: 01305 221837 | g.j.cleaver@dorsetcc.gov.uk<mailto:g.j.cleaver@dorsetcc.gov.uk>
Report property flooding online<<https://apps.geowessex.com/swim>>