

## Development at Dorchester

At the exhibition in Dorchester on the 31<sup>st</sup> August 2018, there were 207 attendees in total. We then received a total of 1,565 responses in relation to the Preferred Options Document specifically relating to Dorchester. The individual comments were broken down as follows:

Number of comments made:

Object: 1,453

Support: 59

Neutral: 53

<b>Specific and general consultation bodies</b>	
<i>The Beaminster Society</i>	<i>Highways England</i>
<i>Charminster Parish Council</i>	<i>Historic England</i>
<i>Churches Ecology Group</i>	<i>Kingston Maurward College</i>
<i>Dorchester Chamber for Business</i>	<i>Moreton Parish Council</i>
<i>Dorchester Civic Society</i>	<i>Natural England</i>
<i>Dorchester Town Council</i>	<i>Piddle Valley Parish Council</i>
<i>Dorset AONB</i>	<i>Stinsford Parish Council</i>
<i>Dorset County Council</i>	<i>The Thomas Hardy Society</i>
<i>Dorset County Hospital</i>	<i>Transport for New Homes</i>
<i>Dorset CPRE</i>	<i>Wessex Water</i>
<i>Dorset, Poole &amp; Bournemouth Local Access Forum</i>	<i>West Dorset CPRE</i>
<i>Dorset Wildlife Trust</i>	<i>Weymouth Civic Society</i>
<i>The Frome Whitfield Residents</i>	
<b>Key landowners / developers</b>	
<i>AJ &amp; RG Barber Ltd</i>	<i>Turner Associates</i>
<i>Duchy of Cornwall</i>	<i>Woodsford Farms</i>
<i>LVA (South West) LLP</i>	<i>Wyatt Homes</i>
<i>North Dorchester Consortium</i>	

## General Comments

### Consultation

- Consultation was badly timed and inadequate.
- Growth assessments for each town are inadequate.
- Did not become aware of the proposals until half way through the consultation therefore missed the local roadshow.
- Have read the extensive consultation material and now am expected to specifically point out which part of the plan I'm commenting on. This will deter many people.
- There appears to be a lack of an adequate Equalities Impact Assessment.
- The Statement of Community Involvement does not appear to be adequate or up to date.

### Design Quality

- New build developments should be designed to fit unobtrusively into existing settlements, be they towns or villages.
- The terms 'highest standard' and 'high standard' are meaningless unless clearly defined.

### Education

- The Plan should allow for flexibility in the provision of school places within the Dorchester school's pyramid. First school provision will be targeted towards locations where need arises. Middle and upper school will be targeted to one or two strategic locations yet to be determined. (Dorset County Council: Children's Services)
- Need explicit reference to 3 phase education contributions. This may include nursery and special educational needs provision. (Dorset County Council: Children's Services)

### Transport

- It is expected that development in Dorchester has the potential to impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN), and the impact of development should therefore be considered in any cumulative assessment of the traffic impact from developments in the Dorchester area. (Highways England)
- Plan should find a new location for park and ride.
- Improvements are necessary at Monkey's Jump and Tesco roundabouts.

### Viability

- A viability assessment of each site should be undertaken before inclusion in the Local Plan.

## Household Recycling Centre

- The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan identifies the need for a household recycling centre, waste transfer facility and depot to serve Dorchester and surrounding areas. Further development around Dorchester and Crossways would add to this need and we would seek further contributions. (Dorset County Council: Minerals & Waste)

## Comments on the Vision for Dorchester

### Support

- Overall strategic vision for Dorchester in the plan has much to commend it in terms of recognition of the heritage of the area, the environmental value of the setting and the need to enhance these qualities.

## Responses on Question 11-i: The Town Centre Strategy for Dorchester prioritises expansion of town centre uses on Charles Street and Trinity Street car parks with Fairfield car park being a reserve site. Do you agree that this is the most appropriate approach for the longer term expansion of Dorchester town centre?

### General Comments on the Town Centre Strategy

- The policies for the town centre have been overtaken by WDDC committee decisions and therefore they need to be rewritten. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Proposals for both Dorchester and Bridport have completely ignored what town dwellers recognise and demand for their towns.

## Comments on Policy DOR1: Dorchester Roman Town Area

### More Detail Required

- Policy could elaborate on how the Roman Town is expressed above and below ground and set out in more detail how the remains should be considered, conserved and celebrated. (Historic England)

## Comments on Policy DOR2 and DOR3: Town Centre Expansion

### DOR2 i): Town Centre Expansion at Charles Street

- New development should be focused on Charles Street and include a larger Waitrose.
- Charles Street should be turned into a shopping precinct with reduced parking.
- Only positive thing to happen at Charles Street is the development of WDDC offices and the Library.

### **DOR<sub>2</sub> ii): Town Centre Expansion at Trinity Street**

- The Trinity Street area remains neglected. Its problems must be addressed in the proposed town centre master plan and in the next stage of the local plan. (Dorchester Civic Society)

### **DOR<sub>3</sub> i): Town Centre Expansion at Fairfield Car Park**

- Forecast retail growth is not great enough to require all three car parks as proposed. Fairfield is sequentially furthest away from town centre, it should be developed last. (Dorset County Hospital)
- The development of the Fairfield site will be to the detriment of the functioning, viability and vitality of the town centre. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- Pleased that development on Fairfield has been dropped.

### **DOR<sub>3</sub> ii): Relocation of the Market on Fairfield Car Park**

- The new policy to 'protect' markets is counterproductive. The charter market should be retained and improved on its existing site. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The market character heritage should be respected. It would give the market a revival to build an inside / outside space instead of the completely open area.
- Retain market on Fairfield. It is within walking distance of the centre and draws people to the town.
- Premature to include Fairfield even as a reserve site until it is demonstrated that there is a suitable location to relocate the market to.
- Market should be supported rather than threatened by development.
- Market needs to be refreshed and diversified rather than the introduction of new high street retailers.

### **DOR<sub>3</sub> iv): Parking Provision on Fairfield**

- Policy for Fairfield car park is not necessary as level of retail need is not evident. Sequentially this site is also not preferable. Parking provision in the town is needed. (Dorset County Hospital)
- Loss of Fairfield car park would be a loss to the town centre.
- Brewery Square currently benefits from Fairfield. If it is lost, there will be significant detriment elsewhere.
- Enforce against on-street parking in residential areas and if more parking is then required, decking Fairfield would be a relatively simple solution.

### **Retail / Town Centre: Retail Frontages**

- Remove secondary shopping frontage on Eldridge Street, Brewery Square as this now has approved residential use. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Add area of Napper's Court and shops at the end of Hardy Arcade / Charles Street to secondary shopping frontage. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The town centre retail designation should be constrained to South Street and one side of Trinity Street.

### **Retail / Town Centre: Town Centre Growth Projections**

- Little or no town centre expansion is likely anywhere at present. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Town Centre expansion should be led by a masterplan and should provide more parking not develop the car parks. Expansion as suggested will damage the existing retail offer. (Dorset County Hospital)
- Retail forecasts are unrealistically high.
- Rise of the internet necessitates the transformation of town centres. Need for a combination of community, leisure, hospitality and retail supported by keeping Fairfield, Charles Street and Trinity Street car parks to enable people to participate effectively and keep the town centre alive.
- There are a number of unoccupied retail units at Brewery Square and on High East / West Street and South Street, so hard to argue a need for more retail units. Only when these are fully utilised should further expansion be considered.
- Strategy of providing more, larger physical retail space is outdated and wrong for the town. Should focus on providing for and encouraging smaller and diverse independent businesses.
- Higher costs (rates, utilities, transport) and increase in internet shopping means high streets are declining.
- Efforts should be made to refit and reconfigure existing retail space rather than creating new.
- The answer to Dorchester's problems is not to build new shops but to find alternative ways to attract people to the town.

### **Transport: General Comments**

- Agree with the proposed approach subject to assessment on impacts of development on key junctions, an appropriate town wide parking management strategy and provision of high quality walking and cycling links. (Dorset County Council: Transport)
- Where are the promised improvements to the railway station?
- South Street enhancements do not work – dangerous for pedestrians and back up of traffic.

### **Public Transport**

- The town has two railway stations giving access to Bournemouth / London and Taunton / Bristol. This would keep carbon footprint to a minimum and reduce road congestion.
- Moving market back to Charles Street is an opportunity to make both areas more effective and efficient. Should include a formal coach / bus drop-off point.

## Car Parking

- Existing off street parking in Dorchester is inadequate and the number of spaces needs to be increased. Removal of parking spaces will have a severe impact on the town including highways safety. (Dorset County Hospital)
- Object to continued pursuit of new retail development when advised that it cannot achieve a net gain for Dorchester. Development on the three car parks will damage the existing retail offer within the town in the short term and therefore any application would not comply with section 7 of NPPF. (Dorset County Hospital)
- Should address the ongoing parking issues in the town before any development can take place. The DCH site cannot become a parking solution for the whole town as this would be at the detriment of patients, visitors and staff who need parking close to the hospital. (Dorset County Hospital)
- If further off street parking is required, the Charles Street car park could be decked.
- Town Centre parking is already hard pressed, through traffic would increase to unacceptable levels. A northern bypass is needed rather than a link road.
- There is limited parking in the town centre streets for residents. There are far more suitable sites for development such as Poundbury and Crossways.
- Existing levels of car parking are generally accepted as being seriously inadequate and will become more so as new housing leads to more residents and more shoppers.
- Parking and housing should be top priorities for Dorchester.
- Town centre parking is being pushed to streets surrounding the town centre. Any development should start with car parking as a priority and not rely on walking, cycling and using P&R as this will not happen in the majority of cases.
- There is a need for more parking in Dorchester however the lack of available land means 'the only way is up' - multi-deck parking. The cost of multi-deck parking is high, however it should be self-funding through increased parking charges. The current short-term shoppers permit tariff means this cannot be achieved.
- Inadequate parking deters visitors whereas adequate parking encourages visitors and shoppers thus will increase Dorchester's prosperity.
- Park and ride facility is essential alongside the development of these sites. Too much of the town is given over to parking at present – you can walk from one end of Dorchester to the other in half an hour (if able-bodied).
- Town centre parking spaces should be a premium for those who genuinely need them with a greater proportion of the land being made available for housing, retail and employment uses.
- Lack of and cost of parking dissuades shoppers from using the town centre.
- All spaces should be equipped with lo-rate electric vehicle charging points.

## **Economy and Jobs**

- Only space needed for retail expansion is the Charles Street development; Fairfield should not be considered at all.
- Suggestion that there are more jobs in the town than people cannot be true due to the number of unemployed people in the town.

## **Housing**

- Dorchester is a centre of employment and should have a large number of homes built to support jobs.
- Social housing should be incorporated into the town centre developments.
- Should be considering housing over retail.
- Build housing on town centre sites to reduce pressure on greenfield land.
- Focus on retail development in town centre is backward looking; there is sufficient adequate retail space given growth of internet. Focus should be on redevelopment of Charles Street for affordable housing.

## **Facilities and Services**

- Dorchester Sports Centre should be improved.

## **Heritage**

- Supporting town centre retail will keep the character of the County Town.
- The town has a unique heritage and needs to concentrate on providing visitor experiences that maximise this.
- Due to the sensitivity of these sites, might the Plan confirm that development will be expected to be of a high quality design that positively responds to the historic character and appearance of the Conservations Area and conserves the significance of any affected heritage asset? (Historic England)
- Development of Charles Street should make the most of the Roman remains leaving them exposed and on display with a visitor and interpretation centre. Large retail buildings can be put in a horse-shoe form along the road around Charles Street.
- Before planning a new hotel in the Charles Street or the Fairfield car-parks, ensure that the King's Arms Hotel is restored before it collapses!
- Fairfield site is part of the character of Dorchester adjacent to Maumbury Rings. Proposed development would be insensitive and counterproductive to the 'vision' and would not promote the town's special character and heritage.

## **Wider Context / Masterplanning**

- Both Charles Street and Trinity Street sites need to be considered in the context of Dorchester's wider infrastructure needs including economic benefit, tourism and leisure with parking and heritage considered.
- The town centre development should be masterplan led and not just have regard to a masterplan. (Dorset County Hospital)

## Delivery

- Developers must be made to pay for all costs up front.

## Comments on DOR4: Brewery Square

### Retail / Entertainment Uses

- Brewery Square is successful as an entertainment area, retail has struggled.

### Parking

- The policy does not make provision for parking and in conjunction with town centre expansion policies, will put additional pressure on parking in the town which increases demand for parking at the hospital. (Dorset County Hospital)

## Comments on DOR6: Dorchester Transport and Environment Plan

### DOR6: General Comments

- The Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) covers a small part of London Road / High East Street. (Dorset County Council: Transport)
- Add mention of the need for high quality walking routes between the town centre and development. (Dorset County Council: Transport)
- Include recommendations for Dorchester Town Centre from the Western Dorset Economic Growth Strategy Transport and Movement Study. (Dorset County Council: Transport)
- Driverless cars will change the way transport will be managed in the future.
- Some junctions have not been improved from a pedestrian perspective (e.g. Five-ways junction).

### DOR6 Criterion ii): The Provision of a Park and Ride Facility

- Support the general principles but do not support the provision of Park and Ride (P&R). Such a facility has been proven not to work and does not suit those who use the hospital (staff and patients) due to the need for equipment, shifts and emergency access. (Dorset County Hospital)
- Do not agree with the size of the proposed P&R at Stadium Roundabout – too big to be viable. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Mindful of the landscape sensitivity of the proposed P&R site, it is important for the plan to set out how any intrusion can be minimised. (Historic England)
- P&R would be technically out of date by the time it was ready. Weymouth P&R demonstrates that the public don't like breaking a journey 5 minutes from their destination and then not having a car in town to off-load shopping etc.

## Comments on DOR7: Poundbury Mixed Use Development

### DOR7: Design / Amenity

- Requirements of Chapter 2 of the plan should be placed on Poundbury to ensure the development is of as high quality as possible in respect to pedestrian safety, cycling provision and quality urban space.

### DOR7 Criterion ii): Transport

- Although Poundbury has extant consent, proximity to the Strategic Road Network (SRN) raises concerns in terms of access arrangements. Impact of development should be considered in any cumulative assessment of traffic impact from developments in the Dorchester area. (Highways England)

### DOR7 Criterion iii): Retail / Town Centre

- Queen Mother Square designated as part of Town Centre. Should this be a 'District' or 'Local' centre? Seems to conflict with Poundbury development brief. (Dorchester Town Council)

## Comments on DOR10: Land South of St Georges Road

### Parking and Traffic

- No further development until parking and traffic issues along Lubbecke Way / Long Bridge Way / St George's Road are resolved. (Dorchester Town Council)

### Design Quality / Affordable Homes

- Recent development at St George's Road is of high quality. Similar would be welcomed to provide affordable homes within walking distance of town centre.

## Comments on Policy DOR12: Former Dorchester Prison

### Support

- Support the redevelopment of the prison. It should be a top priority.
- Support the development.

### Housing Mix / Affordable Homes

- The scheme should include more affordable homes and smaller market homes.
- Larger flats and more three / four bedroom houses are needed on this site.
- The site is stalled; the Local Authority should develop it for affordable housing to meet the needs of those on the housing register.

## Comments on DOR13: Kingston Maurward College

### Support

- Agree with the masterplan to allow for the expansion of college facilities.

### Masterplan

- Stinsford Parish wish to be included as one of the bodies required to approve the Kingston Maurward master plan. (Stinsford Parish Council)

### Hampton Business Park

- Care needed with proposals adjacent to Hampton Business Park. The Business Park could be considered a sustainable location for further employment provision.

## Comments on DOR14: Dorset County Hospital

### DOR14 Criterion i): Health Campus

- Provision of care for those not yet ready to return home (step-down care) and space for those who require assistance but not hospital admission (step-up care) is important. (Dorset County Hospital)
- There is no plan or space to provide hospital wards and additional parking spaces.
- Do not support the policy as it restricts the ability of the hospital to expand provision of a range of facilities for users of the campus. (Dorset County Hospital)

### DOR14 Criterion ii) Masterplanning

- Good quality master planned development on the hospital site would reduce the need for greenfield development and therefore should be a priority.

### DOR14 Criterion iii): Residential Use

- Agree with the provisions for housing. (Dorset County Hospital)

### DOR14 Criterion iv): Retail

- Disagree with the specific wording preventing retail development. (Dorset County Hospital)

### Transport

- Further expansion of the hospital will make traffic problems in the town worse. The council should be supporting decentralising the hospital providing non-critical treatments in the surrounding towns. (Weymouth Civic Society)

**Responses on Question 11-ii: New Policy DOR15 proposes significant expansion of the town on land to the north of the water meadows including the delivery of a link road between the A35 and A37. The proposal includes new homes, employment land and new school provision. Do you have any comments on new Policy DOR15?**

### **Comments on the Overall Development Strategy**

- The maximum delivery rate will be around 240 dwellings per annum (dpa) with the rate being lower in the earlier years (closer to 120 dpa). Paragraph 11.5.3 should be amended to say 'the site will deliver a maximum of 240 dwellings per year'. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- Concerned over the overall level of planned growth across Dorchester and consider that taking a strategic longer-term view is likely to enable better planning of the infrastructure needs of the overall planned growth. (Highways England)
- Detailed vision for the future of the development is essential at this early stage. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Dorchester Town Council objects to Policy DOR15, recognising that this specific site carries a significant level of risk that it will fail to address the local needs of the town, nor will it produce a comprehensive, relevant, viable and sustainable development that supports the area's future; rather it will destabilise it. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Agree with the vision proposed in the plan subject to the removal of the reference to the modest expansion of Charminster - the two allocations are separate. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- Exclude all development south of Coker's Frome Road, west of the gas main that runs north / south past Yalbury House and the dry valley running north / south to Pigeon House Farm thereby allowing farm use from open countryside down to the water meadows. This would maintain the current links between the town and the countryside. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- If the link road runs through the development it will bisect the community in addition to the separation that will result from the water meadows. The two barriers will only distance the communities further from the town centre. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The siting is a poor compromise between building an urban 'extension' which will lack community and social facilities, and a new town or 'Garden Village' which would bring social, environmental and aesthetic cohesion to the whole development. (Stinsford Parish Council)
- The aspirations for how the development could look and feel as set out within the policy, are supported.
- I have reservations about the proposals, however the policy offers a good starting point for discussions and they should not be ruled out without serious consideration.

- The North Dorchester proposal is an improvement over the piecemeal approach suggested through the 2015 Local Plan that struggled to find sufficient land for development.
- Why does the Local Plan propose a preferred option to allow developers to dictate the quantity, quality and design of our towns and villages and allow them by doing so to violate and destroy the character and beauty of the setting of our historic towns and the surrounding countryside?
- Support that the separate identity of Charminster will be maintained.
- The availability of relatively low cost agricultural land should not be a primary driver in deciding the future location of new homes in Dorset.
- Land is graded as mainly 3B and 4 and therefore considered as agriculturally not of such high value as the land now taken by Poundbury which was classed as Grade 2 and 3A.
- Slyers Lane area is very hilly and has superb soil and should be left as good agricultural land.
- Should develop to a basic design specification, cutting profit margins to a minimum and giving little consideration to the character of Dorchester and the surrounding villages.
- Support the proposed development north of Dorchester.
- The Council should be working independently from the North Dorchester Consortium. There has been little consultation on elements of the layout which appear to follow exactly what the Consortium has proposed.

### **Comments on the Vision**

- The vision sounds worthy but it does not allay my fears for how the development is portrayed.
- The proposal is inconsistent with the vision for the town set out at the beginning of the chapter – ‘make the most of the surrounding countryside including its links with Thomas Hardy, Maiden Castle and Kingston Maurward College’.
- The policy should have more ambitious environmental targets – carbon neutral.
- The Government has said that new build housing should be fossil fuel free by 2020. What measures are being put in place to achieve this locally? (Stinsford Parish Council)
- Climate change can already be seen across the planet. It will be felt in food producing and coastal areas like Dorset.
- Developers will not build to any higher standards than current building regulations – the town needs better than this.
- The site offers the potential for combined heat and power and for the homes to be designed to be carbon neutral both in operation and in construction. This should be a requirement not just an aspiration.
- The plan is not based on any vision but just uses land that the landowners want to develop – there is no idea of community or social progress nor how transport will be developed.

- The first paragraph of the placemaking overview has no meaning – what are the principles of placemaking for the site?
- If there is to be rapid population growth, a vision for Dorchester is needed much the same as when Poundbury was proposed.

### **Paragraph 11.5.3: Provision of Infrastructure**

- Would like to see requirements for public transport within the policy and greater clarity on the phasing of the development and what infrastructure will be delivered and when. (Dorset County Council: Transport)

### **Paragraph 11.5.4: Existing Travelling Showpeople's Site**

- The supporting text states that the existing travelling showpeople's site should be relocated. It is unclear whether this should be within the site or off-site. Off site is not within the consortium's gift to deliver alternative land. The relocation / provision of sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople should be left for the Dorset-wide DPD. (North Dorchester Consortium)

### **Paragraphs 11.5.7 to 11.5.8: Movement Strategy**

- If an extension to Dorchester, the development must have easy, quick, non-vehicular access to the middle of Dorchester. It does not. The shape of the proposal contorts Dorchester making journeys into the town long and difficult (Stinsford Parish Council)
- Rail links are currently not suitable for the increase in passenger numbers this development would bring, where are the plans to upgrade rail links and train capacity to and from Dorchester? (Stinsford Parish Council)
- Bus subsidies are being cut and it is unlikely that 'paid for' journeys on any new bus route would be sufficient to make a route viable. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Coker's Frome Road should become a green cycle / pedestrian / bridleway route linking Kingston Maurward / Stinsford with Charminster and cycle routes 2 and 26. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The distance of the proposed development from the town, the A35 / A37 link issue and the disconnected nature of the site risks the development becoming one or more separate communities. The suitable alternatives in the area have not been fully explored. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Between the town and the proposed developments there are rivers, water meadows, SSSIs and extremely limited crossing points. Even if one or more new links could be established across the water meadows and uphill to the town centre, the cost of integrating it into the town centre network could be prohibitive. (Dorchester Town Council)
- A new road connection via Casterbridge Industrial Estate would give a more direct route for public transport rather than via Grey's Bridge. Blue Bridge and other footpath connections could therefore be left in their mainly rural state. (Dorchester Civic Society)

- Cycle and footpath routes across the water meadows are ludicrous given that they flood during periods of high rainfall.
- Should not build on the flood plain but if push away from the town, development will not be connected to Dorchester.
- Building beyond the water meadows would not provide much opportunity to connect the new band of housing with the town. This would increase the likelihood that the new homes would be isolated with more difficult access to the town's amenities.
- The area runs the risk of becoming an isolated part of Dorchester with all of the associated social problems – drugs, unemployment, isolation.
- Development would enable residents to be within the area for employment, schools and all services reducing travel and therefore helping the environment.
- The proposed link road will only add to the current transport problems – alternative solution that makes better use of public transport such as the railway would be better.
- Does it matter that Dorchester has an imbalance of housing and the economically active population? Faster and cheaper public transport links to Weymouth would be a better solution.
- A much improved bus service and a bus station is needed.
- Public transport is currently unreliable, inconvenient and expensive.
- Concern about the existing access road to Frome Whitfield becoming a cycle way / public transport route.
- Elderly will not be able to walk to Dorchester because of the steep hills.
- There is a conflict between reducing reliance on the car and providing roads that increase traffic.
- Links to Dorchester will be expensive and damaging to the environment.
- A bus service linking to the town would not be viable.
- Bus routes are at present inadequate leaving people stranded in villages.
- As the development is so close to Dorchester, everyone will drive rather than cycle or walk.
- Mechanisms to reduce car travel should be sought early rather than trying to alter residents' behaviour after development. The Masterplan could help this by creating over-arching limitations for cars – much easier through strategic development than on small sites.
- Public transport is essential.
- Lack of connection between the development and the town will cause severe traffic problems.
- Transport links seem inadequate for the scale of development. Would better public transport links to Weymouth better tackle the imbalance between jobs and housing in Dorchester? There needs to be a step change in transport provision to make any impact.
- The existing network of public rights of way will be lost.

- The network of green lanes and public rights of way that criss-cross the area are used recreationally by many people. They are valued because of their proximity and accessibility to Dorchester residents and because they provide breath-taking views across the water meadows and town towards the Ridgeway in the distance.
- Affordable housing needs to be near schools so that children can walk and not be driven to school.
- There are very few towns where it is still possible to walk out into open countryside so directly without passing through urban sprawl.
- The historic road layout will cause problems.
- The town centre road network is not capable of being adapted or modified to cope.
- In some areas, the roads are little more than updated farm tracks.
- People will commute to Bournemouth / Poole for better paid jobs.
- Appropriate transport connections with the town are absent and there is an inability to create these without causing further harm to landscape and heritage.
- Proposed transport links and local facilities do not appear to be adequate for the scale of the development.
- A352 through Charminster is already dangerous. Further loading will make this worse.

#### **Paragraph 11.5.12: Planning Obligations**

- Need to see justification that existing services can cope with expanded population.
- The town does not have the infrastructure to absorb the increase in population.
- The town has grown very rapidly over the past 15 years without the necessary increase in public services.
- Adequate infrastructure provision (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking) will be a challenge for the proposed level of growth.
- Fear that the town's existing facilities will not be able to cope with the development.
- People coming to the new homes will be retirees placing additional pressure on local services.
- Dorchester does not have the facilities to cope with 60% of the housing target for West Dorset.
- Police budgets are being cut and additional population will cause additional strain on the Police force.
- The main problem is the rapid expansion without a sufficient infrastructure upgrade.
- Essential that S106 requirements are specifically linked to infrastructure requirements.

- Concern over lack of CIL and reliance on S106 / S248 legal agreements. It will be very difficult for the developers to agree the infrastructure until the full costs are understood through full design of the necessary infrastructure.

**Paragraph 11.5.13: Prior Extraction of Sand and Gravel**

- The area is within the Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for Sand and Gravel and assessment / prior extraction would be required. Reference should be made to this within the supporting text. (Dorset County Council)
- The gravel resource will need to be extracted prior to the development which will result in unknown consequences afterwards.

**Paragraph 11.5.16: Copse Planting**

- DWT supports the planting of additional copses, but these must be of appropriate native broad-leaved species to maximise their wildlife benefit. All existing mature trees should be retained wherever possible. (Dorset Wildlife Trust)

**Paragraph 11.5.24: Heritage Considerations**

- First bullet point - refers to recording pre-Roman and Roman archaeological remains. The potential for some remains needing to be preserved in situ should be mentioned here. Omit reference to 'pre-Roman and Roman' since there is potential for remains dating from other periods as well. (Dorset County Council: Archaeology)
- Appreciate the proposals to protect trees etc. around Frome Whitfield.

**Paragraph 11.5.25: Heritage Considerations**

- The Council should ensure an explicit consideration of alternative versions of the extent and form of development that avoid those areas of the site of most concern, sensitivity and significance. We note and welcome the following extract in the draft Plan 'The historic environment should not be seen only as a constraint to development but an opportunity for creating a sense of place and making a positive contribution to the character of the development. The design should respond to the historic environment and to local character to create attractive and distinctive places within the site'. (Historic England)

**Paragraph 11.5.28: Biodiversity**

- Refer to Hedgehogs rather than Badgers as a species worthy of protection.

**Paragraph 11.5.35: Cokers Frome Showground**

- The showground would have to relocate; it is presently of great economic and social value to the area.
- The Dorchester Agricultural show is held on the site each year.

- The County Showground would be displaced by the development. It has been very successful in this location and it maybe that an alternative location cannot be found close to the county town.
- Provide for the retention of the showground within the site including parking to the east of Slyers Lane. (Dorchester Civic Society)

#### **DOR15 Criterion i): The Masterplan**

- A Masterplan setting out design code, access, travel plans, maintenance of highest design standards and infrastructure provision, is essential. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The Parish Council opposes this urban extension to Dorchester as an intrusion into the open countryside without the appropriate infrastructure being guaranteed. If it were to go ahead the Parish Council requires a Masterplan for the whole site, under the control of the Local Authority and local people rather than the developer. (Charminster Parish Council)
- Proposals for master planning will fail to deliver the necessary physical and community infrastructure and other improvements due to a lack of statutory backing, difficulty in implementing affordable housing proposals without a stronger policy and the lack of integration with Dorchester as a whole. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The Consortium supports the proposal of a masterplan-led design process to reflect the vision for North Dorchester and the detailed site-based analysis. It is the aspiration of the North Dorchester Consortium to undertake a thorough pre-application engagement process to inform the development of the masterplan. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- Higher Burton Farm is arable land (grade 3b) and would lend itself to residential development. It is essential that early robust master planning takes place to ensure accessibility utilising the existing footpaths and bridleways. (AJ & RG Barber)
- A masterplan must be produced for the whole site.
- Given what the local plan inspector said, a master-plan approach to North Dorchester seems best, allowing it to be designed as a cohesive whole. A master-plan has worked well at Poundbury, where I've lived for several years.
- The commitment to master planning is inadequate and the policy does not set out sufficient detail to deliver the vision – commitment from the developers is essential.

#### **DOR15 Criterion i): Public Involvement in the Masterplan**

- The development should be a product of a genuine and long term partnership of local people, public bodies, developers and landowners, including the management of the water meadows, and be different from, but worthy to stand comparison with Poundbury, widely recognised as an exemplar of urban development. (Dorchester Civic Society)

- Any expansion of Dorchester should be led by the town and its people and they should be fully consulted and involved.
- Need to ensure community input into site master planning. Should also consider alternative methods of the community being in control of what happens.
- The development along the lines of a Garden Community would be supported as it gives a greater voice to local people.

#### **DOR15 Criterion i): Masterplanning**

- Swapping the locations of the school campus and the local centre as shown by the council would locate the school on the flattest part of the site. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- Development should commence on the western edge allowing an early start with minimal highway improvements.
- The gap between the development and water meadows is insufficient and the effect on existing properties within the area should be reduced both in terms of noise and pollution from the new link road.
- Need to undertake a full analysis for the proposed development illustrating how proposed development will be integrated with near and wider surroundings – land form, landscape, hydrology, archaeology, geology etc. concept architecture, street scape, landscaping and green infrastructure.
- Placing industrial areas adjacent to flood risk areas increases the likelihood of contaminating sensitive rivers.
- A new development - if deemed essential must be treated as a new town and be designed specifically to be self-sufficient and not be a parasitic development drawing services from Dorchester.
- Consideration has been given to creating a sense of place for the new area, the impact on the identity of the existing town will be adverse.
- The area cannot be considered an extension to Dorchester when it extends so far north and east – it will be urban sprawl.
- There will be impacts on the views to Waterstone Ridge, footpaths, treed landscape, conservation area and historic flood meadows.
- The employment site is not integrated with the housing areas.
- Western limit of the development should be the track to Higher Burton Farm to minimise the impact on Charminster village.
- Housing would link Charminster through Westleaze to create a 'Greater Dorchester' and the limits to the north would be difficult to enforce.
- There are still a lot of issues to resolve – the new showground location, environmental studies, heritage and archaeological studies, traffic analysis, water runoff and flooding.

#### **DOR15 Criterion ii): Overall Scale of Development**

- Needs for employment land across the plan area are being met (ref Policy SUS2) therefore including a requirement for 10ha of employment land, local centres,

education, community needs, healthcare is not based on evidence. There is a risk of creating an imbalance between jobs and people in Dorchester. Amend paragraphs 11.5.5 and 11.5.6 to suggest a maximum of 10ha. (North Dorchester Consortium)

- The development will provide a long-term solution to Dorchester's housing needs, an east-west road link to alleviate east-west traffic flows through the town and on the A35, new education campus, around 80ha of public open space including a visitor's centre, a new employment park and three neighbourhood centres including healthcare facilities. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- The District Council has to respond to a centrally imposed diktat on housing numbers. This will not meet the needs of local people or support the local economy but meet the needs of retirees from the south east who will put strain on our healthcare services. (Dorchester Town Council)
- We adopt a neutral position but note that the development would result in Dorchester having more than its share of the area's housing requirement in an environmentally sensitive area. This should only be entertained if all other options have been exhausted. (Dorchester Chamber for Business)
- Housing numbers are based on over optimistic growth estimates and the council should challenge them. The parish doubt whether Dorchester or Stinsford need the proposed amount of housing. (Stinsford Parish Council)
- The scale of growth proposed is grossly excessive relative to the size of the town. The rural situation is part of the identity and culture of the town. (West Dorset CPRE)
- Westlease appeal site (if approved) would reduce the gap between Charminster and the new development and therefore the development should be significantly reduced in size. (West Dorset CPRE)
- Oppose the grossly excessive (in size) development on an unsuitable site. The town has already had to bear the Poundbury development and developers reduce the number of affordable homes through viability arguments. (West Dorset CPRE)
- The need for more housing is not for local people or Dorset people! The young people of Dorset move away in search of employment, and those that stay, quite simply can't afford the new builds.
- Justification is needed that the housing number correctly reflects the local situation e.g. local population growth. Does it have any link with the needs of the local community and the rural county of Dorset?
- As somebody who has been born and raised in Dorchester and would like to buy a house here in the future this proposal is music to my ears. We need more housing in Dorchester that is affordable and good quality.
- Development of this scale may result in a loss of local character and affect environmental considerations. A bad plan is not the answer to meeting local needs.

- The scale of development is far too large and will drastically alter the character of the area which makes the town such a desirable place to live and visit.
- What about the provision of youth clubs and community halls?
- Community meeting space proposals are inadequate. There needs to be a generously endowed community building, independent of other uses with ample parking and substantial open space for community events.
- The community building should not be adjacent to schools due to thoughtless parent parking.
- National population and migration trends are stabilising and may even reverse with Brexit therefore we should not be using past trends to predict the future.
- Is there sufficient employment land?
- The proposal looks to increase the profits of the developers but does nothing for the long term future of the county town.
- The development offers no benefits to the town or its environs.
- Scale of development (35% increase in population) is too great for Dorchester. The increase will have a severe impact on the town's services and infrastructure.
- Planning for more housing based on house sales in the recent past creates a loop system where the projected requirement is escalated by the volume and type of sales – this does not meet the needs of local people.
- Why should Dorchester take such a large proportion of the homes?
- I understand that new housing is needed but this proposal will have a long term detrimental effect on the area.
- Should encourage people to live together which would reduce loneliness and depression and remove the need for so many houses.
- The development represents at least a 35% increase in the population of Dorchester.
- Some movement of people in and out of an area is 'natural' and healthy for the life of that community as is a mixture of age groups and occupations however, very large numbers can be divisive and take a long time to integrate.
- The Planning Inspector reviewing the previous version of the Local Plan had stipulated that attention should be given to more housing in Dorchester, however this site is only being proposed and at this scale because it is being promoted by a willing landowner. The Inspector did not require housing of this scale and in this environmentally sensitive location.
- Has the data to arrive at 3,500 homes at Dorchester been adjusted to reflect the downward trend of birth rates and immigration for the UK?
- Proposed development north of Dorchester is too big.
- Locating 3,500 homes in one parish seems inappropriate.
- Understand some need for development and can see scope in the area around Stinsford Roundabout and some of the Charminster area, but to build 3,500 is far too large.
- Development needs to be proportionate to the size and role of the town.

- Another large development will affect the sense of place and community that many wish to preserve.
- The town has seen a huge increase in size over a mere 20 years and has yet to digest this most significant change in its population. The proposed 3,500 houses under this plan would increase the population of Dorchester by another 35%
- Why is Dorchester receiving 61% of the growth of the area rather than that growth being distributed across the county?
- The scale of the development and the housing numbers need to be challenged. It is unsustainable to add a town to the edge of Dorchester as the existing infrastructure will not be able to cope.
- The strategic priorities of the plan to 'protect and enhance the outstanding natural and built environment, including its landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity, and the local distinctiveness of places within the area...' is inconsistent with this large development.
- Planned growth will put strain on existing schools and health facilities.
- The proposal is the size of Bridport or Sherborne with hardly any facilities proposed.
- Object to the plans under consideration however would likely support a much reduced alternative.
- The development would change the face of Dorchester. It is far too big and we already have Poundbury.
- Building more homes at Dorchester makes sense however two major urban extensions since the 1990s will overrun the infrastructure.
- Should not be considering such a large development when the town is still adjusting to the impacts of Poundbury.
- Too many homes for Dorchester given the town has already experienced major expansion at Poundbury and Brewery Square.
- Poundbury has altered the dynamics of the town, another large development will alter the character irrevocably.
- Object to the size of the development relative to the historic County Town especially when considered alongside Poundbury.
- Dorchester has grown by more than its fair share recently with Poundbury and Brewery Square. North Dorchester is too much too fast.
- Not against finding land for much needed housing but just not here.
- The idea that people will move to the town rather than commute is unsubstantiated.
- What is the issue with people commuting into the town from the local area?
- The plan states there are 3,000 people on the housing register and with developments in Bridport etc., the need for the development is extremely limited.
- One statement says that there are 15,000 jobs in Dorchester but only 9,500 working age residents – most people who work in the town choose to live in Weymouth, Portland and villages.

- People live in Weymouth for a number of reasons including the sea and slightly cheaper house prices – they will not move to Dorchester.
- The North Dorchester development is a sensible and viable approach to the future of Dorchester and to providing living and other accommodation that is required.
- Poundbury should fulfil the requirements of the local plan.
- It is silly not to expand beyond the Roman boundaries of the town, it is not a good thing that Dorchester hasn't expanded.

#### **DOR15 Criterion ii): Overall Housing Target**

- Question the reliance of the government on household projections data dating back to 2014.
- Unnecessary urbanisation of delicate countryside to achieve a Whitehall diktat.
- Only meeting government set housing targets and these are constantly changing so may not be needed.
- The Council is being bullied by central government to home the growing national population.
- In challenging the housing numbers, the council should be prepared to judicially review government housing numbers / inspectors. (Dorchester Town Council)
- A likely impact of Brexit is slower population growth. The housing numbers seem to be derived with a different expectation in mind.
- Recent research from Office for National Statistics suggests housing targets have been over inflated.
- Must challenge government's assessment of housing need.
- Recent reports in the press suggest that the need for more housing locally and nationally is exaggerated.

#### **DOR15 Criterion ii): School Capacity**

- In addition to the provision of land – there needs to be explicit mention of contributions towards development of the educational infrastructure based on the prevailing rates at the time which may include contributions towards nursery and special educational needs provision. (Dorset County Council)
- School provision will be needed up front as there is no capacity within the existing schools within the town.
- New school provision at middle and upper level is needed.
- Expanded education facilities are not adequately catered for. Provision is made for pre-16 education, however it will take many years for this to be fully operational. Discussion needs to take place to ensure post-16 education provision is adequately provided for off-site by the development. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The proposals for new schools are currently unsustainable. New residents to Stinsford already have problems getting their children into Dorchester schools because of a lack of capacity.

- An upper school cannot exist on 600 pupils.

#### **DOR15 Criterion ii): The Approach to School Provision**

- Having three completely new schools will not be building on existing excellence. The current proposal to build a four-form entry high school in a town with a twenty-form entry upper school is an ill-thought out solution to increasing school places. (Stinsford Parish Council)
- Creating a 4 form entry school would only be viable with a reduced curriculum (e.g. no drama or music) creating an imbalance between the new school and Thomas Hardye. The preference would tend to be for the school with the wider curriculum. An alternative would be to have the new school as part of the Thomas Hardye Academy.
- Parents will want to send their children to the already oversubscribed Thomas Hardye School.
- Absurd to put a 4 form high school in the same town as a 20 form high school.
- Will end up with a good school and a not so good school. Thomas Hardye is such a good school as it is the only school in the town.
- The school age range is too great to work and the facilities for senior children will not compete with Hardye's.
- Dorchester schools will be extremely attractive to potential residents and many will be willing to transport their children to such high achieving schools.
- The allocated site for school should abut open space on at least one side.
- The school should be located in the north west of the development as children from Charminster and Charlton Down would then be in its catchment.
- Siting a school campus close to the road ignores all the evidence about the impact of air pollution on children.

#### **DOR15 Criterion iii): The Route of the A35 / A37 Link Road**

- The proposed development is the last remaining opportunity of providing a northern bypass for the town. Failure to deliver this link will fail to deliver the necessary relief for the town centre especially given the traffic that will result from the development itself and blight the development as a result of through traffic and rat running. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The western portion of the proposed link road is located further north than that which is proposed by the Consortium. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- Suggest more flexible wording in relation to the design of the A37 / A35 link road which must create a sense of place for future residents. Flexibility is necessary until more transport modelling work is complete. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- The western connection between the A37 and the development should be as near to the Weirs Roundabout as possible. In order to meet current and future needs. A route for an East-West bypass should be preserved if not planned for at

this stage. The route could be in a cutting in order reduce noise. (Charminster Parish Council)

- The development would scupper any chance of a northern bypass.
- The proposed link through the development is neither a northern bypass nor a residential street. It will become a rat run!
- The road will disrupt historic, well-used footpaths.
- The link road should span the gap between Stinsford Roundabout and the A35 west of The Old Radio Station.
- The area from Weirs roundabout to the C12 is extremely environmentally sensitive.
- The route of the northern bypass needs to be protected and should be delivered from day one.
- The northern bypass should terminate at Weirs roundabout. The proximity to Wolfeton House should not be seen as an issue as sensitive design can overcome any visual impacts – Wolfeton House is irrelevant.
- The proposed link road is far too near existing housing.
- The link road serving as an estate road through the development is a dreadful idea.
- The road will have a negative impact on the residential areas it passes through.
- Ridiculous having the proposed A35 / A37 link running through a residential area. It will be busy with HGVs, holiday traffic, all traffic moving east-west and traffic to / from the east / Yeovil. It will cause pollution and conflicts between pedestrians and traffic.
- The new link road should be moved to the north of the new development with residential inside and employment outside the road.
- The proposed link road going through the development will make crossing from one side of the development to the other dangerous for pedestrians. Traffic noise will increase as it slows and increases its speed.
- The road will have a detrimental impact on all in Westleaze Close.
- A road going through the development rather than around the edge will cause a barrier to pedestrian and cycle flows and will deter people from using these routes. This will in turn cause greater reliance on car to gain access to town exacerbating the existing congestion, parking and pollution problems in town.
- New road and those created as part of Charminster developments, will cut through cycle routes, how will this conflict be managed?
- The proposed road would become the main route for those travelling from the east to Devon and the M5 with the inevitable conflicts with local traffic.
- The current bypass avoided beautiful unspoilt and tranquil landscape to the north of the town. The proposals will have a detrimental effect on the natural landscape, noise levels and congestion without addressing the housing problem.
- The road will blight the open nature of the water meadows buffer between Charminster and Poundbury.

### **DOR15 Criterion i): Comments on the A35 / A37 Link Road Capacity**

- Modelling shows that development with the delivery of the link road offers a better result in 2041 than if no development takes place. However, it will change the way traffic is managed around the town causing delays at key junctions – mitigation will be necessary. (Dorset County Council: Transport)
- The Stinsford Hill, Stadium and Monkey Jump roundabouts are already overloaded and traffic will increase with 3,500 new homes. The proposed link road includes an abrupt bend and terminates at an incongruous point on the outskirts of Dorchester. A comprehensive traffic masterplan for Dorchester and surrounding roads is needed before any increase in housing numbers is proposed. (Stinsford Parish Council)
- It is unclear how the demands for through movements (along the road that will become the northern bypass) will be reconciled with local access and a street network that encourages non car movements (Dorchester Town Council)
- A single carriageway link road is a short term solution which would result in the road system only having a short life span. No detail of routes of the roads. (AJ & RG Barber)
- The A35 and A37 should be upgraded to dual carriageways with underpasses to existing roundabouts.
- I'm pleased to see the North Dorchester scheme has a main road through it that will cut congestion on the long A35 route around three-quarters of Dorchester, including the busy Stadium roundabout, by connecting the northern A37 and the eastern A35.
- The link road will help ease the short-cut traffic along London Rd into High East St and its Air Quality Management Area.
- Support the new road linking the A37 to A35 to reduce traffic through the town.
- The much needed 'Northern Link Road' will divert traffic destined for Yeovil or Bridport away from the existing bypass to the more direct and environmentally efficient route.
- The urgently needed Northern bypass would improve road links through and within the area. It would encourage companies to relocate to the area.
- A link road will relieve the overloaded southern bypass as the primary route serving the ever expanding Weymouth / Portland conurbation.
- Anything which gets the Northern Bypass added has to be good news. This would also allow the Old Sherborne road to be upgraded to an A-class road. This should be done as soon as possible and not be related to the completion of the development area.
- The northern by-pass needs to be a dual carriageway in order to accommodate current and future traffic needs.
- The road will be at capacity once it's built due to predicted and existing traffic.
- Building a new small town right on the only route for a northern bypass for the town is a short-sighted approach.

- If the area is going to accept significant housing growth there must be some significant benefits – a northern bypass to the town is necessary.
- There is a need for a dual carriageway standard bypass for the town. The southern bypass was not built to this standard and therefore there is a need for the northern route to be dual carriageway.
- The proposed link road may help to accommodate some east – west traffic but this will be cancelled out by the huge number of journeys being made into the town by people from the new community.
- The link road as proposed is neither a bypass nor an estate road.
- The road will become gridlocked from the start with people cutting through from the A35 to the A37 and from people accessing the new housing estates.
- The road as planned cannot be a North Dorchester By-Pass as it will have completely different traffic usage and cannot be shared as the high speed and heavy by-pass traffic will be dangerous to the local residents accessing their homes.
- The link road should meet at the Weirs Roundabout.
- The relief road will offer no relief once over 3,000 additional cars are added to the existing struggling road network.
- The new road should be designed to prevent it becoming a rat run.
- Significant improvements to the road system are needed if the economy is to grow.
- Northern bypass or estate road with multiple roundabouts?
- The link road between the A35 and the B3147 would be used by the residents of the new housing to access the existing main routes and the town leading to severe traffic jams at peak times affecting all residents as well as visitors coming to the town.
- Dispersing growth would remove the opportunity to improve traffic conditions around the town.
- Traffic going through the town will be reduced as a result of the new northern link road however this will be replaced by traffic generated from the development.
- The proposal will seriously exacerbate the traffic situation to a point when traffic will grind to a halt. The High Street, The Grove and the Lidl junction are already overloaded.

**DOR15 Criterion iii): Comments on the Delivery of the A35/A37 Link Road**

- The strategic road infrastructure should be operating before any building development commences. (Charminster Parish Council)
- Development will make it difficult to access Frome Whitfield properties including during the construction phase due to its narrowness. Should not commence works until the new roads are built and ready for use. Need an independent traffic plan for consultation.

- The road through Charminster must become 'access only'. It is already used as Dorchester's northern bypass even though it runs through the conservation area.
- Action is needed to improve the Westhill / North Street, Charminster crossroads, which is an accident blackspot.
- Roads and other infrastructure need to be put in place up front – are the developers willing to make such an investment?
- The link road is a multi-purpose piece of infrastructure, helping to relieve traffic around and through the town as well as serving the development. The plan should not stipulate the number of junctions along the new link road. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- Road and bridge links should be built first to minimise impact on A35.

#### **DOR15 Criterion iii): The Impact on Biodiversity of the A35 / A37 Link Road**

- The proposed road bypassing Dorchester to the north must have wildlife tunnels and bridges incorporated into the design as it will sever the wildlife habitats and corridors.
- Natural England has concerns regarding the alignment and design of the proposed A35 and A37 link road. The new road would cross one of the channels of the River Frome and bisect the River Frome floodplain. In our view the policy and supporting text should provide for a detailed options appraisal for the alignment and design of the crossing of the River Frome floodplain with a view to ensuring the final scheme minimises, as far as is possible, adverse impacts on the functioning floodplain, biodiversity including ecological connectivity and impacts on wetland birds, heritage and landscape interests. (Natural England)
- Concern over the impact of the new road. It will make traffic at Top-o-town Roundabout worse, will have environmental impacts at the water meadows and will impact on Frome Whitfield parkland.

#### **DOR15 Criterion iv): Affordable Housing and Affordability**

- Support the concept of providing an appropriate level of affordable housing for this part of West Dorset.
- Support the development of high quality affordable housing to the north of Dorchester.
- Totally agree on the dominant need for 'affordable housing' especially for younger working people. It seems entirely possible that the only new housing needed in Dorchester at present is for this category.
- Affordable Housing needs to be provided at 50% of market value (rather than 80%) to meet the needs of the local community. Genuinely affordable rental homes are also needed to meet the needs of those who have no prospect of being able to afford to buy. We are not convinced that the affordable housing requirement (35%) will be met by the development. (Dorchester Town Council)

- Affordable homes should be priced so that the young and families can aspire to own their own home and should be used to encourage youngsters to live and work in Dorchester - shared ownership achieves this. (Dorchester Chamber for Business)
- Dorchester needs to have high quality housing with good design to ensure longevity and the provision of 35% affordable housing needs to be considered within this context. Higher Burton Farm could be brought forward without the need for major road works. (AJ & RG Barber)
- If the plan really intended to provide affordable homes then it would set out how this would be achieved with certainty – it is a 'free market' plan to feed private firm's pockets.
- Badly need affordable homes but homes will go to wealthy retirees who move here from London and the north.
- Planning policy needs to be implemented that genuinely favours affordable housing otherwise second homes and retirees will dominate the market.
- Unless funding is ring-fenced for affordable housing, infrastructure and the 'place making' requirements, the development will not meet the areas needs.
- Agree housing is needed but it must be affordable to those on low wages locally not just the national average.
- The need is for council houses or homes for rent at an affordable rate.
- It is unlikely that the policy will deliver 35% affordable housing – just look at the prison development.
- 80% of market value is not affordable to local people.
- With the ageing population, there is a need for affordable homes to house the healthcare workers needed to care for older people.
- Allocating sites for 100% affordable housing is the only way to suppress the land value and therefore deliver genuinely affordable homes.
- Sell some land at a lower rate to ensure affordable homes are built.
- Affordable housing would not be available to local people.
- The area would be supported if 80% was for affordable homes as an exception site (65% to rent and 35% affordable) allowing the land to be reserved for people with a link to the town.
- If a family can afford a mortgage, they often have little left over to live on never mind spend in the local economy.
- Concern affordable housing would not be affordable for existing Dorchester residents. Local people on average earn £15-£20,000 a year so it is unlikely that local people will be able to afford to live in this development.
- No guarantee that the affordable housing will be genuinely affordable (50% market value) and a downturn in the housing market will make it harder to deliver.
- Affordable housing needs to be built soon to enable the young to buy.
- A bigger proportion of the housing should be affordable (some suggest 40% some suggest 50%).

- Should be a range of rental and part ownership options. 80% of market value is not affordable to local people.
- The development will only increase the investment market around the town with more second homes and buy-to-let rentals at full market rental prices.
- Unless a primary residency restriction is placed on all market homes, there will be a significant uplift in local property prices.
- Suggest fixing the price of homes as a multiplier of local incomes and should be restricted to people who have lived and worked in the area for a reasonable period of time.
- Many people will buy retirement, second or holiday homes and won't have jobs to go to adding to the demand on local services.
- How affordable will the houses be? Concern over homes being sold as holiday homes and to retirees.
- Reduce second home ownership.
- There is only a need for affordable and social housing. House prices are 12 times average wages.
- Great demand for a (second / holiday / retirement) home in this lovely area not only raises house prices but in time must risk spoiling the very ambience desired.
- Second homes (6,699) and empty properties (1,200) indicate a large pool of underused housing making the development unnecessary.
- Need restrictions so that housing cannot be bought as second homes.
- Housing will be sold for second homes and holiday homes and not for local people who badly need to rent therefore will not solve the affordability issues in the area.
- Teacher and GP recruitment will be difficult with many already put off by the expensive house prices.

#### **DOR15 Criterion iv): Meeting Local Housing Need**

- Should the areas not provide sufficient affordable housing, there could be scope to extend north of Badger Copse. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- Prioritise housing for young local people to enable them to remain in the town and support the local economy.
- There is an assumption that the local economy is going to continue to grow. However this is far from certain and will result in increased sale of houses mainly to retirees and second-home purchasers.
- Yes to more housing but it must be local authority controlled and only for people already living and working here not commuters or second home owners.
- It would be better to locate housing in areas where there is a shortage in supply for local workers.
- The development would destroy a unique open space for Dorchester for the needs of others moving from elsewhere and at the expense of local people.

- Should restrict the purchasable proportion of affordable homes to ensure they remain affordable for local people and to ensure some degree of mobility occurs.
- Agree with the sentiment within the plan but there are no provisions to prevent second homes, retirees or buy-to-let landlords purchasing all of the homes. The development is therefore not meeting the needs of local people.
- Restrict all new development at Poundbury to four storey and high density affordable homes. This would evaporate demand favouring poor locals.
- People who work in the town will not move to these new houses as house prices in Dorchester are too high.
- Homes will not be affordable for local people if sold at market prices.
- Need more housing for young people but prices are too high for people on low wages.
- Recent developments have not met the needs of local people (luxury million pound apartments). Councillors have approved these homes which now means huge swathes of greenfield land are required to meet the needs of local people.
- If 35% was for rental accommodation through responsible landlords it would encourage local families to work and have families in the local area. A secure rental property becomes a real home.
- Businesses will want to attract high quality employees many of which will be moving to the area from areas of high house prices. They will be able to outcompete local people in the local housing market.

#### **DOR15 Criterion iv): Type of Housing to be Provided**

- House types must be appropriate and include enough affordable homes for local people. (Charminster Parish Council)
- House sizes should be based on the needs of local people.
- Would like to see a plan for a hierarchy of homes across the site with homes for people as they age – small rented homes through to care homes and nursing homes.
- If serious about attracting younger residents, shouldn't give permission for so many retirement properties or 1 / 2 bed flats.
- There should only be retirement only properties if there can also be young person only properties.
- Do not want or need any building of prestigious / executive homes north of the town, or in any other area surrounding the town.

#### **DOR15 Criterion iv): Need for Housing, Particularly for Young People**

- There should be restrictions on the letting of the homes to those who work in Dorchester. (Dorchester Chamber for Business)
- Urgently need more houses in and around Dorchester to allow young people to have somewhere affordable to live.

- Support the idea of further housing, as there is limited space for Dorchester expansion.
- Support the development of North Dorchester and the surrounding area allowing for young families to live more comfortably in Dorchester.
- I'm sure you will receive objections from the elder population of Dorchester who do not like change, but its young people's future and this housing is essential.
- Housing is limited for young people in the area and the area proposed is the right location. Keen for Dorchester to grow so my teenage children and young daughter in the future can get a home in the town they were born in.
- Support this proposal as the town needs more housing.
- Landlords are abusing the housing crisis by raising rents, evicting tenants and not maintaining properties.
- Housing will be uneconomical to rent.
- I strongly support the development of new housing to the north of the River Frome.

#### **DOR15 Criterion iv): Housing Delivery**

- Need to provide affordable housing in every village and town to house care workers for the ageing population.
- Other Dorchester sites should contribute towards affordable housing provision – Charles Street, Fairfield, Trinity Street and London Road.
- Affordable housing is needed but it should be spread around the county as this enables young families to stay in their village communities protecting rural life.
- Need to establish the need for homes for first time buyers and meet this need in the places where first time buyers live and have family connections. This would revitalise village communities supporting village shops, schools etc.
- Development should be by the local authority or housing associations and not by speculative developers. Landowners should receive a fair return and not the ridiculous return likely.
- Community land trusts and self-build housing should be provided for.
- Should include self-build homes.
- Should include homes built by the council using modular construction.
- There are innovative developments in villages where first time buyers can buy a cheaper 'shell' of a house and complete the remainder at their own pace whilst living in it.
- Part build some homes to enable them to be finished by local people to their standards.
- Schools are oversubscribed and roads struggle to cope with traffic. If the way to address this is through well planned and well thought out development of additional homes to support investment, I think it's a good plan.
- Should explore some of the modern pre-fabricated options available to deliver energy saving, compactness and comfort.

### **DOR15 Criterion v): Pedestrian and Cycle Links**

- Welcome references in the Plan Review to the creation of 'additional cycle and pedestrian links'. However, we are concerned that nothing is said about the legal status of these links and would strongly recommend that the text be modified throughout the document to specify that the default requirement is that these links will be dedicated as a public right of way (RoW). There should be additional text containing a commitment to ensuring that this basic RoW connectivity is maintained and indicating the process through which it is achieved. (Dorset, Poole & Bournemouth Local Access Forum)
- The new housing proposed especially near Dorchester, does not comply with the NPPF in terms of sustainable transport and government aims for active travel. (Transport for New Homes)
- The distances involved may be sufficiently long to deter residents from using them regularly, particularly during the winter months. Without a clear visual link, physical link and importantly a strong psychological link, between the new neighbourhoods and the existing town centre, sustainable modes of travel are unlikely to account for many of the travel movements that will arise. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The scheme should functionally integrated with Dorchester through direct cycle links across the water meadows – not car dependent. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- A town where it is easy to walk straight out into countryside must be a rare thing now – the benefit will not be for local people but for developers pockets.
- Cycle paths should be provided between Kingston Maurward College and the new schools.
- Support the creation of cycle paths linking Dorchester to the new development enabling local families to enjoy cycling safely around Dorchester.
- Footpath links should be provided to the east to avoid the areas that flood.
- Approve of the creation of cycle paths in North Dorchester to create eco-friendly transport alternatives and the opportunity to enjoy the countryside.
- The requirement for cycle storage should be amended to say 'secure' cycle storage.
- The three proposed footpath and cycle routes proposed could not function as viable and safe alternatives to road travel unless they were wide enough for pedestrians and cyclists to pass safely and unless they were lit by street lighting.
- Dorchester has very low levels of commuter cycling. For cycling to be a realistic option would not only require the creation of a fully integrated cycle network within the expanded town; it would also require promotion of a cycling culture locally.
- Much is made of plans to provide pedestrian and cycle path access across the water meadows. The number of people walking and cycling will be very small. Anybody with a significant number of retail purchases to make, and the people from all but the nearest houses to town will expect to drive and need to park.
- Bike routes across the water meadows will become impassable in winter.

- Development must include ease of access to facilities in town – not only cycle routes but connections to existing routes and providing designated cycle parking to encourage a more sustainable environment. Congestion is already beyond capacity of existing roads.
- The idea that people will walk into town is preposterous as the paths consistently flood and it is more than a 20 minute walk.
- Many residents of the new area will not want to or be able to walk / cycle to the town.
- No mention that existing rights of way / cycle ways will be maintained.

### **Transport: Impact on the Strategic Road Network**

- There is potential for development to impact significantly on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and therefore will need careful planning to ensure that sites can be delivered in a sustainable manner, reducing external vehicular movements. There is likely to be a residual impact on the SRN which will require appropriate mitigation. (Highways England)
- Work to date includes details of the access proposals for sites in close proximity to the SRN but does not yet include details of mitigation that may be required elsewhere on the SRN. This would form part of the transport evidence base needed to support the plan. We await the outcome of this work to assist in forming a view of the acceptability of the development and associated mitigation requirements. (Highways England)
- The North Dorchester development will be likely to have a significant impact on the operation of the SRN, specifically the A35 junctions nearest the development. Given that there are issues already present on the SRN, it is likely that significant levels of growth will require major upgrades to the junctions around Dorchester. (Highways England)
- There is insufficient capacity on the existing A35 at peak periods. Stinsford Roundabout is congested as is The Grove. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The main problem is traffic at A35 / A354 Stadium Roundabout and traffic joining the A35 at Monkey's Jump roundabout. The A35 / A37 link will have limited impact. (Weymouth Civic Society)
- The lack of a complete ring road for the town should not be seen as a barrier as existing junctions on A35 can be upgraded to deliver growth at a significantly lower cost.

### **Transport: Car Parking**

- No mention of extra parking.
- Need a Park and Ride to tackle on-street parking problems.
- Need to tackle the on-street parking issues in Dorchester.
- Must include a Park & Ride for Dorchester to cope with current and future traffic and parking problems in the town. Parking charges need to be raised to help incentivise use of Park & Ride.

- The planned growth and road will not reduce traffic congestion in the town but will put strain on existing parking provision.
- Where will all of these additional people park?
- There are not enough car parking spaces. The existing cars belong to council workers and people visiting the hospital. New multi-storey car parks will be needed. The park and ride system has been abandoned.
- The disconnect between the new development and the town will increase traffic and parking problems.

#### **Transport: Pollution Associated with Traffic**

- The lack of a transport strategy for the area is likely to result in the plan being found unsound. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- New roads attract more vehicles, to the detriment of the environment and to the physical and mental health of people living nearby.
- Traffic will negatively impact on the town and surrounding areas with pollution and congestion harming people's health.
- There are already congestion, pollution and parking problems in the town. The main form of transport from the development will not be bicycle or walking and bus routes are minimal. Building the northern road will make the problems worse and will not stop the town being used as a shortcut.
- Leaving the water meadows untouched and building beyond them is a good idea, but more people in a concentrated area will amplify the air pollution problems that Dorchester already suffers.
- Pollution levels are already above what is recommended. It is unsafe to have more traffic.
- More houses equals more cars, more congestion, more pollution, more noise, more disruption.
- The creation of a separate suburb will generate considerable additional volumes of traffic and air pollution.
- The addition of 7,000 cars to the town's roads will cause air pollution and traffic congestion and cannot be described as a neutral impact.
- There is a need to identify and assess the existing transportation network and its integration with the proposed link road.

#### **Transport: Local Road Capacity**

- Lack of alternatives will force residents to travel into the town centre by car adding to the congestion within the town, on the approach roads to the town and the parking problems within the town. (Dorchester Town Council)
- We find that even without DOR15 the local road infrastructure at certain times cannot cope. This includes the A35 as it passes Dorchester and the Weymouth Relief Road. (West Dorset CPRE)
- Impact on traffic volumes along B3143 is our primary concern. (Piddle Valley Parish Council)

- The North Dorchester option appears sensible for both town and traffic.
- The development will cause road safety issues due to the significant increase in traffic.
- Local roads at the moment cannot cope including the A35 as it passes Dorchester and the Weymouth Relief Road.
- Traffic in Dorchester is gridlocked especially on market day – a worse situation will harm the viability of the market.
- Slycer's Lane is the main access from all of the villages to the north of the town, additional traffic will adversely affect these existing users.
- Grey's Bridge is a pinch point at the access to the town from the east.
- Stinsford Hill / London Road is often blocked due to queueing traffic along the A35 from the end of the dual carriageway to Stadium Roundabout – often in both directions.
- The proposed development will never integrate with Dorchester but will have a significant impact as a result of the traffic generated.
- Traffic in and around the town is already a problem and not due to people taking a shortcut through the town.
- Measures to address traffic will be difficult within the conservation areas.
- The proposal will exacerbate the issues on the A35 Stinsford Roundabout.
- All traffic accessing Dorchester from the new development will need to travel along London Road or The Grove, both of which are already severely congested.
- The plan makes inadequate provision for connecting the development to Dorchester – The increased road traffic would cause gridlock.
- Object to the proposal as it is isolated from Dorchester and will be accessed via two already busy roads. This will lead to congestion and difficulties in parking.
- Existing road infrastructure is from the 1960s. The development will severely strain this infrastructure.
- Existing roads are unable to cope with current levels of traffic.
- New roads reduce congestion but produce more journeys.
- Employment located adjacent to the A35 will cause traffic congestion on the A35 and more HGV movements along local roads such as Slycer's Lane to Piddlehinton.

**DOR15 Criterion vi): Provision of Retail Within the Site**

- The development edge should be moved northward, in particular it should relocate the local centre to take advantage of the complex of Victorian barns. The existing barns and farm buildings should be incorporated into the development. (AJ & RG Barber – landowner)
- The local centre should include a large supermarket rather than a small one.
- Business and retail premises are already vacant so there is no need for any more.
- Any shopping facilities within the development must augment the Dorchester shopping experience. Should not repeat the Poundbury experiment with

substandard size supermarkets and retail scattered pointlessly. There should be one clearly defined centre in the development.

- Should not develop an additional 3,500 new homes without an enhanced town centre.
- Retail beyond the town centre would need to be convenience retail which has not been proven to be viable elsewhere.

#### **DOR15 Criterion vii): Healthcare Provision**

- No mention of how the development will contribute towards the cost of the expansion of medical facilities including GP surgeries and hospital expansion. (Dorchester Town Council)
- How will the costs for the expensive medical facilities and schools be met?
- GP surgery must be operational from day one.
- Doctors' surgeries are becoming bigger and further away from the rural areas they serve.
- With an increasing aged population, how will medical facilities cope?
- An increase in older people will put additional strain on hospitals and health and social care.
- Medical facilities in the town will be stretched beyond their safe limit.
- The need for a larger, well thought out hospital plan is a requirement of any future development in Weymouth, Dorchester or Crossways.
- Can the councils, hospital, schools cope with this increase in population? An assessment is needed.
- An additional hospital in the area would help.
- There is a shortage of GPs and practice nurses nationally. The development would put a strain on existing health facilities and the hospital.
- No NHS funding is available for expanded health facilities – GPs and hospital.
- Did the CCG review take account of this proposed population expansion?
- Has the impact on health services been considered – GPs, mental health services, Dorset County Hospital?
- Proposed schools and health infrastructure would be insufficient to support the development.
- GP facilities will only work where there is a lack of provision currently e.g. Charminster / Charlton Down.

#### **DOR14 Criterion viii): Views in the Landscape**

- The proposal incorporates as green infrastructure a number of green spaces shown on the map as strategic landscaping.
- Large scale development on this site would be highly visible from the town and surrounding AONB – extra copse areas would not be sufficient to mitigate this.
- Development here would complement the Town. It is less visually intrusive than Poundbury having far less impact on the landscape and heritage assets. In my

- view Poundbury has destroyed the visual setting of Maiden Castle – how can anyone who supported Poundbury object to development to the north?
- Consideration should be made of the views from the footpath leading north from the River Walk from the western side. In the distance you see the ground rising above the flat river meadow with fine mature trees. If this distant view remains intact I will have no further concern.
  - The development represents a further degradation of Dorchester’s immediate environment.
  - I can stand in the centre of Dorchester and see countryside around. This is what makes the town so appealing.
  - The development will significantly change the views from the fields north of Poundbury Cemetery.

**DOR14 Criterion viii): Landscape Character**

- The proposal for development at North of Dorchester will have a harmful impact on sensitive landscape and the relationship between Dorchester and open countryside to the north. The Council’s own Landscape and Heritage Study states, in reference to this area, that ‘development could potentially degrade or eliminate this functional and historical relationship’. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The development should safeguard the landscape and heritage assets that make Dorchester and its setting so attractive, enjoyable and memorable, and provide a balanced mix of housing including a significant proportion of affordable homes. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- Less than 20 years ago one of Dorchester’s unique characteristics was how it was seen from the outside; only slowly revealing itself as the traveller approached from any of the 4 cardinal points along the line of old roman roads. Poundbury has put paid to that. The proposal would sever the town’s last connection with the countryside.
- Changing the character of the area, destroying natural beauty would be counter productive.
- ‘The principle of large scale development in this open area would be fundamentally at odds with the local landscape character’: quoted from Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, North Dorchester (April 2013).
- The area is highly treasured by many inhabitants of and visitors to Dorchester for its unspoilt rural landscape.
- The area northwards from Hangman’s Cottage is a unique combination of water meadows, hedges, copses, streams, drainage ditches and a rich diversity of trees as visible in the path via the blue bridge up to Slyers Lane and to the trackway leading onto the Downs. It should be preserved for future generations.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if mitigation will prevent no adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape and environment (i.e. the landscape transitions from the Frome to parkland, veteran trees, mature hedgerows, woods and on to chalk downland).

- The rising land, comprising gently rolling hills, fields, copses and woodland creates an immediate and compelling visual contrast with the townscape which is highly visible from Dorchester and a wide surrounding area.
- The area to the north of Dorchester is of historic importance. It forms part of a beautiful landscape and must be preserved for future generations.
- I am distraught by the proposal to destroy Dorchester's beautiful green northern boundary with an urban development. Our heritage landscape is valuable for recreation, farming and nature and is readily accessible from the town – a place to breathe and simply be.
- Urbanisation of the water meadows will destroy the town's setting.
- The area is fundamental to the character of the town.
- Part of the charm of Dorchester is its defined boundary. We do not want it to merge with other towns and villages.
- Walking in the north Dorchester area; it is so beautiful to be in the rolling hills there as there is such tranquillity and rolling Dorset landscape. The development must be stopped.
- The area north of the town should be afforded AONB status as it is equally as attractive and environmentally special.
- Development will introduce an incongruous and widely visible built town right into this sensitive upland landscape whose historical and literary associations are so central to the wider economic value in terms of tourism, radically changing the character of the town. Building must never be introduced on the slopes above the historic water meadows.
- The town's appeal and attractiveness is derived from its intimate, small character.
- The town needs to remain a healthy and sustainable environment suitable to an area of outstanding natural beauty.
- This is the wrong development in the wrong place; destroying a particularly beautiful area of classic Dorset countryside for the enrichment of the few, and to the detriment of existing residents of the area.
- Any development outside of the bypass is objectionable.
- The close relationship between the town centre and open countryside is a vital part of Dorchester's heritage and character which would be destroyed by the proposal.
- Development of this site would ruin the town forever. Its charm rests in its small size and rural location.
- The area, which is rich in heritage, wildlife and prominent walkways expresses the genuine and unique surroundings to Dorchester.
- The sharp cut off between the town and countryside on the northern side of the town is distinctive. The proposed development north of Dorchester would change the character of the town drastically and irrevocably. It would cause deep damage to the town heritage and to the cultural landscape of north Dorchester.

- Dorchester has retained its character over the years and one of the joys of living, and visiting, here is the merging of the town into the surrounding countryside.
- The Frome river and flood plain is a unique and beautiful feature of Dorchester and development next to it would do it irreparable harm.
- Loss of character may make people move away from the town.
- Control of what the development will be like will be lost with environmental or cultural considerations losing out to developer profit.

#### **DOR14 Criterion viii): The Hardy Landscape**

- The northern boundary of the town is now the last remaining Roman and Hardyean countryside edge. Development would ensure the destruction of Hardy's literary landscape. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The North Dorchester area is relatively unspoilt and is as described by Hardy. The area to the southeast of Dorchester was rejected on literary, ecological and historic importance grounds but the north Dorchester development would be far more damaging. It would constitute an act of the most severe literary, historic and environmental vandalism. (The Thomas Hardy Society)
- The proposed development would constitute a gross intrusion into a unique highly valued landscape both for its intrinsic beauty and its association with Thomas Hardy. It would impinge on key vistas both inside and outside of the AONB.
- Building 3,500 homes on the downs – so clearly visible from the town centre – would destroy this unique landscape forever. The view over the water meadows is one of the most iconic in the Dorchester area, written about by Thomas Hardy, William Barnes and John Cowper Powys.
- If this development goes ahead, the visual impact from Fordington, and from the water meadows looking back towards the town, would be irreparable. This is a culturally and historically important landscape written about by Thomas Hardy and valued by all those who live nearby and walk there.
- The proposed development would constitute a gross intrusion into a unique landscape which is highly valued locally, nationally and world-wide for both its intrinsic beauty and its association with the works of Thomas Hardy. It would also impinge on key viewpoints from both inside and outside the Dorset AONB.
- One of the unique selling points of Dorchester is the way it has retained its relationship with the surrounding landscape. It would still be recognisable to Thomas Hardy.
- A gross intrusion into a unique highly valued landscape both for its intrinsic beauty and its association with Thomas Hardy.
- The development would have a devastating impact upon the views north from Dorchester and the proposal to plant trees will miss the point that the views, as described by Hardy, are of the patchwork of small fields.

- Many visitors to the town expect to be able to see some of the landscape that Hardy wrote about. This is notable about Dorchester but will no longer be the case if this development goes ahead.
- This landscape is central to the understanding and definition of Hardy's Wessex.
- The countryside is the foremost reason we chose to take our trip to Dorchester - to see, experience and achieve a deeper understanding the land Hardy wrote about. Were the land to be developed, there would be little reason to return.
- Many people visit Dorchester from Britain and around the world because of the landscape immortalised in the works of Thomas Hardy.
- Dorset's major tourist assets are archaeology, geology, natural environment and landscape where many of the works of Thomas Hardy are set. The proposed development would be cultural and heritage vandalism.

#### **DOR14 Criterion viii): Landscape Mitigation**

- The scale of the North Dorchester development will make a historic step change impact on Dorchester. It will fundamentally change the town's character. Large scale development is an easy option for hitting national housing targets but does not address local impacts of development. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Concerning views from the AONB, there is a reasonable prospect of effective long-term mitigation through a landscape strategy and masterplan. The approach currently suggested by the consultation document is insufficient. (Dorset AONB)
- The key views of the site area are from the south and the west. Effective mitigation will require internal planting across an internal 'grid' connected to roads and green infrastructure corridors and avoidance of development and limitations on housing density. (Dorset AONB)
- It would be beneficial for housing development to be excluded from the tops of the broad ridgelines that run north-south through the site which could instead form green infrastructure corridors and serve functional purposes. Back clothing the development with a significant band of woodland planting would notably soften the appearance of the development in the landscape. (Dorset AONB)
- Whilst firmly in favour of developing some type of garden village, this isn't the right location with landscape detriment to the fore. My understanding is that the likely developers will not deliver well designed schemes which will fit into the landscape. (Dorset CPRE)
- We have withdrawn development from the field east of Frome Whitfield House and provided a green landscape set back to the north. However, we suggest that the extent of open space suggested by the council in this area be reconsidered in the light of the evidence submitted. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- We suggest a landscape led masterplan approach would achieve the desired outcomes and filter the views of the development. Specific references to planting of additional copse areas and new planting along a grid of roads are

- unnecessary as the landscape strategy for the site should be informed by a response to careful site analysis. (North Dorchester Consortium)
- Integrating North Dorchester into the landscape is a good objective.
  - The development would be visible from a large area and trees would not be sufficient to mitigate the impact.

**DOR14 Criterion viii): The Setting of Dorchester in the Landscape**

- Development should not take place to the south of Coker's Frome Road to maintain the separation of the development from the northern edge of Dorchester and Coker's Frome water meadows.
- The development proposal is in an unspoiled area of Dorset countryside at its best. To destroy this would be vandalism.
- The joy of Dorchester is in its setting. Development has eaten into the countryside around the town, but so far not to any degree on its northern side. Once that countryside is gone, you have changed the setting of the town in its landscape forever.
- This proposal does not show respect for the setting of historic Dorchester or for the prehistoric landscape of the area. The urban / rural divide of the River Frome to the north and A35 to the south are essential.
- The town has lost so much of its vista especially due to Poundbury. The proposed development would further destroy the countryside surrounding the town.
- The area is the town's last green space and development would change the face of the town.
- The setting of the historic county town of Dorchester rising from the flood plain of the Frome and encircled by chalk downs would be adversely affected.
- We already have a dreadful scar on the landscape (Poundbury) which will never be disguised with trees made worse by the lighting on the Royal Pavilion.
- The view of the town from the north has not changed for centuries and is a classic English county town landscape of spires and buildings framed within a verdant rural setting.
- This wholesale destruction of the unique relationship Dorchester has with its surrounding landscape surely needs rethinking.
- Destruction of Dorchester's character will overwhelm the identity of the town as a market town in its rural setting.
- The unique qualities of the green spaces surrounding Dorchester were recorded by the important writer Daniel Defoe.

**DOR14 Criterion viii): Impact on the Water Meadows**

- The view of Dorchester from the north shows how contained the town is by its water meadows with a clear distinction between town and country that will be lost with this development.

- The only way in which the development could begin to be reasonably well integrated with the town would be by significantly harming the green buffer which separates the two areas.
- The area is so beautiful and will be spoilt by the development. Walks along the Mill Stream and Frome are enhanced by the views.
- Development will destroy the AONB and water meadows – it is wrong.
- Development will be a blot on the landscape especially from sensitive areas such as Poundbury Hillfort and the water meadows.
- Lovers Lane (crossing Blue Bridge) is a bridleway used by many people and forms part of the Frome Valley Way. There are many impressive ancient trees including an ancient oak at its far end which create a feeling of tranquillity and natural beauty. The land either side of this bridleway needs to be protected.
- The proximity of development to Charminster is a concern. Development to the west of Charminster has little impact on the character of the village. A gap equivalent to the distance from Charminster to Dorchester should be maintained around the whole village.

#### **DOR14 Criterion ix): Historic Environment - Heritage Assets**

- The plan and evidence emphasise the significance of this development. The historic landscape contains many heritage assets and provides the setting to various others. The numerous heritage values of these assets, the adjacent townscape and surrounding landscape further accentuate the importance and sensitivity of the proposed allocation. (Historic England)
- The immediate transition from the town to water meadows to the north is a defining and attractive characteristic of Dorchester, which adds considerably to passive interpretation of the extent of the original Roman settlement. In accordance with national policy, great weight needs to be applied to protect, and where appropriate enhance, the significance of affected designated heritage assets, in this case the setting of the Dorchester Conservation Area. (Historic England)
- The setting of the Conservation Area - including the much loved 'Ratty's Trail' - will be marred with the loss of the 'clean cut and distinct edge' of Hardy's Casterbridge. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The new link road from A35 to A37 would go very close to the historic Wolfeton House and across the Water Meadows. It would be extremely detrimental to the spatial and visual aspect of the area. It would ruin Thomas Hardy's literary and cultural heritage and Roman Durnovaria.
- I feel the older parts of Dorchester should remain as is. Poundbury improved Dorchester and I now feel outer Dorchester spaces should be developed.
- There will be an impact on Poundbury Fort, the Roman aqueduct and numerous grade I and II\* listed buildings and conservation areas. They will be over-run by urban sprawl.
- The historic boundaries of Frome Whitfield House should be respected.

- There are the remains of parkland containing a number of specimen trees which are significant to the setting of the conservation area.
- The policy fails to mention the relationship with Dorchester itself despite the development facing the historic town centre, conservation area and many listed buildings which abut the water meadows. The setting of these assets needs to be protected.
- The setting and visual appreciation of numerous important heritage assets would be adversely affected (the setting of the county town, scheduled ancient monuments and numerous listed buildings).
- An ancient copse forming garden boundaries, the trees in Yalbury Park creating a parkland scene, and the trees between Frome House and Cocker's Frome Road are of special importance and were historically part of Frome Whitfield Manor parkland and gardens.
- The historic value of the water meadows is under represented in the document.
- The 'Dorset' offer is coast and countryside, rural industries, sustainable small scale activity; people focused companies, high quality farming and food production, an exceptionally rich heritage and a warm welcome to visitors. Development should be spread around to protect this heritage.

#### **DOR14 Criterion ix): Historic Environment - Archaeology**

- There have been some significant medieval and prehistoric finds on the site.
- Need to ensure a thorough archaeological investigation takes place.
- The area contains a number of deserted medieval settlements.
- Deep part of the heritage of Britain running up to Stonehenge, rich in archaeology as one of the longest inhabited landscapes in Britain.
- Archaeology of the site needs to be investigated and displayed.

#### **DOR14 Criterion ix): Historic Environment - Hardy Heritage**

- An application to erect wind turbines in Oxenhope Parish in the heart of Bronte Country was rejected by Bradford City Council on the grounds the turbines would destroy the visual impact of a landscape of international literary importance. 'North Dorchester' would be a new conurbation of far greater environmental impact than the proposed wind turbines in Bronte Country. (The Thomas Hardy Society)
- In Hardy's Mayor of Casterbridge, he describes Dorchester as '...a chessboard on a green table cloth'. This close connection between town and countryside is a given for the town's residents and is a popular attraction for many visitors, with its origins dating back to Roman times. Many tourism guides reference the water meadows and celebrate the fact that Dorchester has managed to retain its impressive heritage and landscape. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The flood plain historically and currently defines the town boundary and this housing allocation is effectively a 'new town' destroying the whole context and character of Hardy's Dorchester and its surroundings.

- The area has deep associations with Hardy and a danger that it will be lost to a Hardy themed nature trail and tourist centre as a 'sugar pill' to the development.
- The provision of a park or enhanced water meadows would not make up for the loss of Hardy's legacy.
- A similar planning application to develop the area north of Dorchester was turned down by a planning inspector in 1988 because of the timelessness of this precious place, the cultural significance to Thomas Hardy's writing on Casterbridge, and its importance in the paintings of Henry Moule.
- The town is steeped in history from the Romans to Hardy and Barnes.
- The proposal will destroy 'the setting of Dorchester and its heritage assets' (mentioned in the vision) as described by Hardy.

#### **DOR14 Criterion ix): Historic Environment - The Historic Landscape**

- Of particular concern to Historic England is the rising land in the middle portion of the site. If the local authority is to progress the principle of the allocation, without prejudice to our view of that principle, we would recommend that you provide a clear and explicit response to the challenges and guidance set out in the LUC Report, in respect of the whole site and the development at Charminster. This may indicate the extent to which development might positively respond to the context, minimise harm and maximise heritage benefits. (Historic England)
- Notwithstanding the heritage concerns, a garden village would be supported. (Dorset CPRE)
- There has been no depth of thought to the proposal and it is not sympathetic to the area. There appears to be a total disregard for this heritage landscape. The area under consideration is timeless and especially tells the story of Hardy through his own words.
- Thomas Hardy noted the sudden change from town to open fields. This has disappeared to the south and west due to urban expansion. The line still remains to the north but is at risk of being changed by the local plan.
- The development will destroy the town's unique character. It will stop Dorchester being 'Hardy's' country town, with direct views and countryside access from so close to its centre.
- The enhancement of the water meadows will destroy the very thing that makes them so worth saving.
- Looking towards the town from the north is the only direction from which a timeless view is still possible, as all other approaches to the historic centre have been built upon with compromising modern development. This rare juxtaposition of historic town and water meadow would be greatly harmed by the proposed development as it would fundamentally take away the greater part of the green setting of the town centre.
- Cultural significance is reflected in the town's historical, cultural and landscape setting.

- The proposal does not show respect to the town's historic setting nor the pre-historic landscape of the area.
- Henry Joseph Moule painted numerous, highly detailed Victorian watercolours of the countryside around Dorchester.
- The Victorians valued this northern countryside.
- One of the best, understated but significant views is from Cornhill in South Street past the Bow and North Square capturing the parkland with its signature trees adjacent to Frome Whitfield beyond Blue Bridge.
- The northern boundary of the county town has remained in place since Roman times. As a local guide the proximity of the countryside is consistently remarked upon and is recognised as a feature of the town. This feature will continue to have a vital role as new visitor attractions lend weight to the town's future archaeologically, historically, culturally and economically.
- The water meadows are a unique heritage asset illustrating specialist farming practices of the area.
- The development would harm the historic boundary edge of north Dorchester and increase demand on local services. Any benefits would be far outweighed by the harm.

#### **DOR14 Criterion ix): Historic Environment - Impact on Heritage-led Tourism**

- We note that it is considered that as part of the development, initiatives may help the town's tourist economy to expand through enhancements to the water meadows and capitalising on Dorchester's Hardy heritage. (Historic England)
- Recent heritage investments (Dorset County Museum, Shire Hall, Hardy's birthplace) gain meaning from their beautiful but fragile rural context. The proposed development would threaten this heritage by upsetting the balance of settlement and landscape. (Stinsford Parish Council)
- People visit West Dorset because of the relatively unspoilt countryside and that Hardy described it so intimately in his novels and poems. Development at this site will just be another nail in the coffin for tourism in West Dorset. Although much has changed in the 140 years since this novel was published, the strict division between town and country persists unaltered along the Roman northern boundaries of the town. The proposal for large scale development to the south east of Dorchester was over-ruled primarily on grounds of its deleterious impact on a sensitive landscape of literary, ecological and historical importance. The North Dorchester proposal would have a far worse impact on the local environment in all these same categories. The whole of Stinsford Parish includes sites of literary pilgrimage to which people travel from all over the world. The construction of 'North Dorchester' would therefore constitute an act of the most severe literary, historic and environmental vandalism. (The Thomas Hardy Society)

- The strict division between town and country persists unaltered along the Roman northern boundaries of the town. Development would be another nail in the coffin for tourism in West Dorset. (The Thomas Hardy Society)
- The importance of Dorchester's heritage has been recognised by the investment of £15 million by the Heritage Lottery Fund in The County Museum and Shire Hall. Cultural tourism has the potential to add more but only if we don't wreck the product.
- The views from North Dorchester looking out across the beautiful water meadows almost taken back to the time of Hardy himself, is an experience thousands of tourists relish each year. What are we to offer them? A picture of what the fields used to look like? A signpost on a new street which reads 'Watermeadow Way'? Will that be all that is left of Hardy's Casterbridge?
- Hardy's novels attract a large number of tourists to the area. We implore you not to lose our only remaining link to Thomas Hardy, his life, his works his Wessex.
- Cultural tourism has the potential to be of value, but only if we don't wreck the product.
- There will be an impact on the Hardy-related tourist industry of the town.
- There will be an impact on tourism as a result of the development.
- Maintaining the town's resilience in relation to tourism seems particularly important when the Dorset County Museum is undergoing such significant redevelopment.
- Tourists come to Dorchester for its history and quaintness with many using the river walks. They will not want to walk through housing estates.
- Need to consider another museum to attract tourists to the virtual reality of Hardy Country, surrounding chalk downland, AONB and nature reserves.
- Water meadows are of cultural significance which contribute to the tourist industry of the town.

#### **DOR15 Criterion x): Flood Risk**

- Support for part x) of the policy – 'Areas at flood risk from all sources will be avoided. The development will deliver a flood mitigation strategy which makes best use of the opportunities on the site with a viable deliverable flood mitigation strategy being implemented'. (Dorset County Council: Lead Local Flood Authority)

#### **DOR15 Criterion x): Surface Water Flooding**

- There must be no surface water connection to the existing foul sewer network. Any surface water connections discovered should be redirected to the SuDS scheme which is an essential requirement for the whole site. (Wessex Water)
- Developing on arable land will inevitably cause increased surface water run-off which will cause flooding downstream from the site.

- The water meadows already flood annually and slight changes to the ploughing of fields and altering of an access track have already led to water pooling around Frome Whitfield House.
- Where will the surface water holding tanks be positioned? The water meadows will not be able to cope with the increase in water runoff.
- Hard surfaces will worsen flooding problems in Frome Whitfield and downstream and proposals do not adequately deal with the problem.
- Run-off rates will increase causing flooding downstream given climate change.
- Water runoff threatens the integrity of Frome Whitfield House which has stood since the Domesday book.

#### **DOR15 Criterion x): General Comments on Flooding**

- The proposed development would exacerbate flooding and cause concerns for wildlife habitats. A flood mitigation strategy – preventing fluvial flooding, surface water run-off and groundwater flooding – must be agreed prior to allocation. (Dorchester Town Council)
- There is potential for major flooding in the area. (West Dorset CPRE)
- During the winter and spring the water meadows are often flooded and it is not possible to walk across them. How will the water meadows provide access to Dorchester at night and in the winter months?
- Building a large settlement above the water meadows will affect the water run-off and may cause changes such as additional flooding or drying. This could affect the SSSI downstream and possibly also the internationally important Poole Harbour wetlands site.
- Surface water, ground water, flood plains and water meadows along with the impact on the SSSI need to be the subject of a detailed hydrology study.
- Adding to a stretched drainage system at this time of climate change is not thought through.
- There will be a risk of erosion and flooding downstream.
- Ground water levels will have an impact on ground stability and flooding downstream.
- The River Cerne flows into the River Frome and further development will cause flows to back-up. Any building in this area is of great concern for the local community.
- Ground water levels will be elevated due to the development.
- Water meadows have seen increasing flood levels over the past five years.
- Even if drainage measures for the new development are effective, an increase in risk to existing properties will result.
- The flood plain serves to protect low lying houses in extreme weather and should continue to be farmed as private land.
- Buildings will be on the flood plain.
- Existing properties are already effected by flooding and damp and this will only get worse.

- A detailed hydrological survey is needed to understand where flooding is likely to happen.
- No building on steep slopes.

#### **DOR15 Criterion xi): Nitrogen Neutrality in Poole Harbour**

- Pollution levels in Poole Harbour are 'a threat' and WDDC is one of the bodies responsible for managing it. Areas outside of the Poole Harbour catchment should be seriously considered over Dorchester. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The developer needs to provide concrete assurance that there will be no impact on Poole Harbour – nitrates, phosphates and drainage from streets and roofs. The flood plain should be removed from the development area and the idea of an arts or interpretive centre / café should be removed. There will be no room for the necessary SuDS.
- The impact on Poole Harbour's nationally and internationally designated sites could lead to the loss of some bird and other species.

#### **DOR15 Criterion xi): Biodiversity Enhancement**

- A key challenge for the proposals will be to ensure that visitor access to the River Frome floodplain is appropriately managed through both design and ongoing access management provision. In particular, it will be important to ensure substantive areas within the nature reserve and wider areas act as refuges for riparian wildlife and water birds. Natural England recommends that the policy includes a clear requirement for delivering a demonstrable net gain for biodiversity. (Natural England)
- The opportunity should be taken for biodiversity enhancement of any grassland areas created within the development and the areas designated as open spaces, wherever possible. (Dorset Wildlife Trust)
- Although there would be some gain through positive management of the river areas this would not offset the loss of the 700 acres of habitat.
- The area is of significant biodiversity importance. Any development will undoubtedly have a negative effect on this. Protecting a small area of water meadows by way of a nature reserve would not suffice.
- The development will substantially reduce the gap between Dorchester and the village of Charminster, and the remaining open fields on the eastern and southern side of Charminster should be protected from any further development in order to retain their function as wildlife corridors. (Dorset Wildlife Trust)
- The option covers a very large area of open countryside, and will result in the loss of a large area of grassland and a large number of hedgerows. This will require mitigation for the loss of habitat. Despite the substantial open space areas proposed it will be essential to maximise the nature conservation value of the 'buffer' area including along the flood zone and beyond. (Dorset Wildlife Trust)

- The area is prime farmland with lots of wildlife species and some ancient trees.
- One only has to look at the green fields with their trees, birds, animals and hedgerows to realise that this is not a place for a development of this scale. To destroy all this with a high density housing estate is to betray Hardy's country and not a legacy that local officials should want to leave.
- The allocation does not fully address impacts on water quality and undisturbed priority floodplain grazing marsh, river corridor and protected species. The mitigation proposed (limited to on-site) includes habitat which already exists and whilst some may be enhanced for wildlife, given the size of development proposed, it is inadequate and will not achieve the required net gain.
- New road, traffic, pedestrians across the water meadows would affect the natural wildlife habitat and biodiversity – a Site of Special Scientific Interest.
- Links between the water meadows and the areas beyond is the key to its diversity. This development would effectively sever that connection.
- Access from the development would be difficult without harming the water meadow's wildlife.
- There will be a massive loss of hedgerow wildlife corridors and disruptions to wildlife habitats for bats, badgers, dormice and deer should this development be approved. These fields, woods, lanes and trackways are a vital green space for hundreds of people, who appreciate the easy and largely untrammelled access to open countryside. The area links to nearby Thorncombe and Grey's Woods and to the AONB.
- Concern over the impact of dog exercising in the areas left for wildlife. There may be significant harm to biodiversity and to the SSSI downstream.
- Flood plain supports a delicate balance of wildlife which will be totally disrupted by proposed development and the impact on water levels.
- Insufficient evidence to demonstrate no adverse impact on biodiversity and habitats.
- There will be a decline in native species as a result of this development.
- Development would destroy the habitat of many red list bird species.
- Need careful evaluation of flora and fauna before and after the development.
- Significant biodiversity interests would be affected, including: bats (long eared brown bat), deer, slow worms, kingfishers, water voles, polecats, otters, ducks, newts, owls, woodpeckers, badgers, foxes, moles, hedgehogs, wild pheasants, wildflowers (bluebells, wild honeysuckle, cowslips) butterflies, bees and skylarks.
- The area includes the breeding territories of ravens, yellowhammers, linnets and whitethroats, among many other species.
- There are two SSSIs in near proximity, as well as a LNR. 117 species of birds have been listed. Otters have been recorded in the River Frome. The river is an important habitat for water voles and other river dwelling animals.
- The River Frome provides a chalk bed habitat to many invertebrates and birds, and fish. The Environment Agency report confirms that there are rare species on

this habitat, and that any disruption to this habitat will result in the loss of wildlife and these rare species.

- The River Frome downstream from the site is a designated SSSI and the impact on the aquatics, vegetation and wildlife would be irreversible.
- What impact will the proposed cycle / pedestrian routes have on the water meadows / River Frome SSSI and the other SSSIs downstream? How will the proposed cycle / pedestrian routes across the water meadows deal with being flooded every winter?
- Wetland and downland environment would be lost.

#### **DOR15 Criterion xii): Local Nature Reserve Provision**

- DWT supports the intention to create a Local Nature Reserve along the water-meadows within this area as a key part of the infrastructure. Further green corridors through the development should also be created, and all of the proposed pedestrian / cycle linkages to Dorchester should be created as wildlife rich corridors. (Dorset Wildlife Trust)
- The creation of a recreation park / nature reserve on the water meadows would not balance the loss of ecosystems. How would it be maintained? Volunteers are difficult to find.
- Designating a LNR does nothing to mitigate the damage.
- The proposed visitor centre and associated access road and parking will be a significant development that would reduce the available green space.
- The water meadows already 'form a high quality asset' for the town. The development will degrade them by removing them from their wider landscape context. Cynically designating them a LNR does nothing to mitigate the damage done to the non water meadow landscape.
- The water meadows could become a public park or recreation area, increasing public accessibility.
- The area is already accessible via the footpaths, building on the countryside whilst claiming to make the area 'more accessible' is ludicrous.
- The benefits to physical and mental health of spending time in the natural environment are well documented. Development of the area north of the town would mean that people would have to travel further (probably by car) to get their fresh air / nature fix.

#### **DOR15 Criterion xii): Green Infrastructure More Generally**

- Any additional people movement across the water meadows and the infrastructure to support it will negatively impact on a unique place whose centuries-old land use quietly and un-assumedly showcases Dorchester's agricultural heritage. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Which part of the area within the site boundary could be actively farmed? How will the community within the site be built and what sort of community will it be? (Dorchester Civic Society)

- Natural England has no objection to the principle of the allocation and supports the policy requirements for the provision of a Local Nature Reserve and biodiversity enhancements within the water meadows. (Natural England)
- There is no equivalent network of footpaths or immediacy of access on any other side of the town. This access should be preserved at all cost in order to support (a) the views which afford residents and visitors aesthetic pleasures which are associated with mental wellbeing, and (b) the opportunities for recreation which afford so many residents and visitors great pleasure, physical exercise and mental wellbeing.
- Social amenities would be adversely affected through the reduction of bridleways and footpaths running through the sites.
- Will we lose allotments and parts of existing nature reserves?
- Need to provide allotments.
- Development will reduce the quality of life of existing residents in adjacent areas.
- Dorchester is peaceful, has charm and is friendly and welcoming. This could be jeopardised by expansion which is too rapid or the loss of familiar and valued resources such as easy access to countryside.
- Strongly object to the development – urban sprawl is bad for people’s health.
- Being able to walk along the river and experience countryside is important to the health and wellbeing of residents.
- Walking in this area is important for the health of residents.
- This land provides the lungs of the town and provides a tranquil environment to escape the all too often hectic town life. This stretch of countryside is much loved by those living in the area providing access for exercise.
- Increased linkages across the water meadows will reduce their impact as an open space.
- Compensation and mitigation will be necessary where there is impact on registered common land at West Ward Common.
- The plan should mention ‘all the water meadows area including West Ward Common will be managed as a nature park for the benefit of people and nature’.
- The water meadows would in effect become an urban park.
- I'm happy with the preferred North Dorchester option as long as the planned Green Infrastructure doesn't get nibbled away in the planning stages.
- Increased linkages across the meadows will reduce their impact as an open space readily available for recreation.
- There will be reduced use and enjoyment of the bridleways and footpaths that run through the development area.
- Particularly like the green spaces and trees in the plan and the increased access to the water meadows that will separate North Dorchester from the existing town. The water meadows will be easily walkable from the town centre and this encourages their use for recreation and exercise by all three surrounding areas of Dorchester, Charminster, and the new North Dorchester.

- The site is one of the few remaining green lungs and essential recreational facilities serving the town and surrounding villages - valued by walkers, cyclists and horse-riders alike.
- Water meadows should not be used as playgrounds / dog walking / sports areas nor built on.
- The best development to 'enhance' the water meadows would be no development. Present public use is modest and sustainable with minimal impact. I fear that as a result of the development with the associated plans proposed by Turnberry, the reverse would be true.
- The landscape around Frome House (a historic building in its own right) is scenic and a popular area for walkers and lovers of countryside, within a very short distance of the town. With the current proposals, all this will be lost and views to the north will be ruined.
- Development should be restricted to those areas shown on the plan and should not encroach on areas marked green. The separate identity of Charminster must be maintained.
- Loss of water meadows would impact on residents' quality of life.
- The water meadow complex of habitats that exist on the north side of the town enrich resident's lives.
- There seems to be no provision for open spaces within the site for general recreation, dog-walking, ball games and play, let alone play areas for younger children. A community of more than 3,000 homes, suggesting more than 7,000 residents, has a vital need for such facilities.

#### **DOR15 Criterion xiii): Design and Masterplanning**

- The plan should set out pre-requisites for the development including protecting key views, protecting clean cut, distinct edge to the north side of Dorchester. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The development should have a distinct character and sense of place with the water meadows retaining their sense of place. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The development should be an exemplar sustainable neighbourhood drawing on the best of past best practice and future innovations. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The housing could be anywhere in the UK as good locally reflective design does not fit with developers business models.
- The architecture of Poundbury makes it more like an extension to London than to the historic county town.
- Affordable housing should be of a regular cottage design organised in quads with an inner courtyard where children can play.
- Density zones are yet to be defined.
- If the development was to go ahead, the town would become similar to Poole with its endless sprawling characterless suburbs.

- Employment land on the A35 gateway to the town would be hugely damaging to the historic tourist town.
- Include public charging points for electric vehicles.
- The area is the only rural part left with easy access from the town centre. The character of the town will be completely destroyed if this area is covered with high density housing.
- Affordable homes will be poor and high density with insufficient parking and private garden space.
- Developers and landowners will gain a significant receipt from the development however the quality of the homes delivered by Persimmon is low – can they be trusted with such a special site?
- Designs should be beautiful and modern – no more pastiche.
- Should be designed to enhance health.
- Poundbury is a visionary development. The proposed north Dorchester development will come nowhere near to this standard.
- Tree planting should offer 20% tree canopy cover within the urban areas.
- It seems no screening of the employment land from the A35 is proposed.
- The location and heights of the buildings should be determined by topography and impact on views from surrounding areas. The development should be on valley sides leaving all summits and south facing slopes clear.

#### **Comments on Infrastructure Delivery**

- Due to current infrastructure deficiencies, some infrastructure (e.g. schools, sewerage, highways) will need to be provided upfront and operated inefficiently for the first few years. (Dorchester Town Council)
- It must be recognised that the impact of the development stretches further than the boundaries of the site and will impact on Dorchester itself. The development will place significant additional burden on the town's sports, cultural and recreational infrastructure. Allowance for this should be made within the policy for the site. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The uplift in land value once the area is identified as an option will mean that the chances of securing funding for the necessary infrastructure is diminished. (Stinsford Parish Council)
- The current proposals include schools, GP surgeries and shops. Where are the proposals for other facilities; a library, arts centre, sports hall, social centre, gardens, restaurants, cafés, cinema, pubs and so forth? The sense of place will be one of being in the wrong location and having to go elsewhere for all social and cultural events. (Stinsford Parish Council)
- As a free standing settlement it should have identity and social cohesion, community infrastructure and meeting spaces. These have not been planned in. (Stinsford Parish Council)
- There will be little supporting infrastructure and few long-term employment gains.

- Facilities must be fully planned and not allowed to happen haphazardly.
- The infrastructure (roads, railways, sewage) has not markedly changed since the 1960s/70s and this development will substantially increase the demands on it. This is exacerbated by developments in Weymouth and to the west.
- Huge infrastructure cost would make the development unviable.
- New schools and new healthcare provision is needed before homes are occupied. Unless this happens, the development will cripple Dorchester. Developers must be willing to make this investment.
- Not enough attention has been paid to the access to health, education and community facilities.
- Unless developers commit to putting all relevant infrastructure in place upfront, the development will cripple Dorchester. The town's schools, parking and other services are already stretched.
- Existing farm buildings at Higher Burton Farm could be utilised as a community facility, local centre or for employment and should be included within the scheme.
- What facilities beyond the supermarket will be planned? Poundbury has pubs, cafes, shops, meeting places and this will be needed within the North Dorchester development.
- Poundbury has delivered social infrastructure and affordable housing due to the commitment of the landowner and the production of a strict masterplan. The same cannot be said about the landowners / developers of the North Dorchester site.
- The council should agree funding of infrastructure with developers through a signed legal contract prior to the site being allocated.
- The Inspector required a reappraisal of the options for growth around Dorchester and not for the council to put the majority of growth there – infrastructure is totally inadequate.
- The cumulative impact on access, services and amenities of the town centre expansion, Brewery Square, 3,500 homes at north Dorchester, 4,000 homes at Crossways, 300 homes at Charminster have not been fully assessed.

### **Comments about Sewerage Infrastructure**

- The River Frome is protected. Discharge of sewage effluent into it will be costly and will require upgrading.
- Dorchester's sewerage system is at capacity and will require significant contributions for upgrade. There will be a resultant impact on Poole Harbour. There is a need to secure mitigation towards nitrogen neutrality before the development is formally agreed. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Sewerage infrastructure will need upgrading ahead of the development.
- Sewerage system will not cope.
- Sewerage infrastructure across the water meadows and along Kings Road and Lubecke Way will be disruptive. There are major implications for Louds Mill.

- Has the impact of development been assessed on recycling, water and energy supplies, sewerage and drainage?
- Upgrades in utilities infrastructure (drainage, sewerage etc.) will further degrade the local environment.

### **Comments about Viability**

- There is a wide range of infrastructure requirements associated with development at Dorchester including affordable housing, highways and cultural requirements. An independent viability assessment should be undertaken to establish whether the site can deliver on these requirements. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The primary concern is the delivery of affordable housing and that the developers should not be able to use viability to get out of this obligation alongside the necessary infrastructure provision (road link, doctor's surgery, environment, drainage, schools...) (Dorchester Chamber for Business)
- Include clauses that secure benefits should they exceed those established in viability assessments.
- The development will lead to the exploitation of the viability loophole.
- The viability argument will be used to get out of obligations set out in the policy.
- Affordable housing will be argued out of on viability grounds.
- Unconvinced that the affordable housing and infrastructure requirements will be met by the developers.
- With the costly infrastructure requirements, the developers will claim that 35% affordable housing will not be viable.
- The policy states that '35% of the homes should be affordable' rather than 'must be affordable'. This shows only a lukewarm commitment to providing affordable housing which would be reduced by developer viability arguments.

### **Comments about the Character of Nearby Villages**

- The focus is on protecting the character of Charminster but other villages, such as Frome Whitfield, are ignored.
- Frome Whitfield is a separate hamlet in its own right and the development proposed will swallow the hamlet within high density extension to Dorchester.
- There will be complete loss of the identity of the hamlet of Frome Whitfield, its community and historical significance.
- Frome Whitfield is an historical hamlet included in the Domesday Book and the historic home of Robert, John and Higo de Whitfield, Lord Denzel Hollies (former MP for Dorchester) and the famous Dorset Henning family.
- Frome Whitfield hamlet contains the remains of St Nicholas Church and village, the Georgian Manor House, the Victorian era large red-brick barn, stables and Japanese gardens.
- The area is not part of Dorchester but part of Stinsford and other villages including Frome Whitfield.

- Frome Whitfield is a collection of small and large dwellings scattered along lanes with Frome House at its core and set in agricultural land / water meadows.
- The development is continuing the surrounding of Charminster.
- Charminster should remain a separate entity and extensions to the north should be limited. The AONB, which begins just north of Charlton Down, should remain untouched by development and development between Charminster and Charlton Down should be refused to protect their own separate identity. With these provisos I think development to meet future local needs is sensible.
- If agricultural land to the west of B3143 and east of Charminster were to be developed, something very precious will be lost.
- Development is too close to Charminster and impinges too far into the water meadows.

### **Comments Relating to Climate Change Mitigation**

- Development to the south and east of the town would leave the northern fields free for solar power.
- Fear the developers will put profits above the delivery of truly effective energy saving measures and solar panels all of which should be fitted at the point of construction.
- Wind energy proposals on same piece of land were turned down. Surely these 3,500 homes will need clean energy to future proof them against peak oil / climate change?
- Concern over taking land out of food production. Buildings should at least be required to farm solar energy.

### **Comments about the Local Economy and Jobs**

- Not convinced that the proposal would foster a modern business environment. A block of employment land does not reflect modern business needs – need an integrated mix of units to suggest a forward thinking mixed use approach. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Not clear if there is sufficient employment land to sustain the new population. Will put pressure on services within the existing town. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Pleased that the consultation document recognises the particular challenges that Dorchester has in attracting / retaining youngsters and families of working age to live and work in Dorchester because of the cost of houses in and around the town. For Dorchester, this issue is compounded due to the desirability of the town for those beyond working age. Too many of the employees in Dorchester work in the town but live elsewhere and too often that is out of necessity. It is not good for the businesses of Dorchester, or the future of the town itself. (Dorchester Chamber for Business)

- The assumption that West Dorset needs more workers to counter the increasing elderly population needs re-evaluating given the changing working patterns, employment levels and demographics. (Stinsford Parish Council)
- As a local employer, I have noticed significant under-employment (unsuitably skilled). There is no driver to bringing additional employment to the area without significant additional employment opportunities.
- Need to front load economic expansion to entice economically active residents to the area – A shift of people from Weymouth will have serious local economic and social implications.
- A fully developed economic development plan for the local economy is needed prior to the site being built.
- Challenge whether Dorchester can attract the necessary inward investment to expand its economy.
- Need to have new 'value added' high paying employment plans in place, not just local service industries.
- Global trend is for a move towards urban areas where there are more jobs, amenities and cultural and religious facilities. Why therefore put development in this rural location?
- Development will contribute to the economic vibrancy of the town.
- It is optimistic to think that businesses will relocate to Dorchester without some direct incentives. Other towns have more in the way of facilities for employees.
- A wide range of employment opportunities will be needed.
- The town is large enough to offer commerce and culture whilst compact enough to enable an easy walk to the countryside.
- Dorchester is a major area of employment and therefore should have a large number of houses built to support the jobs.
- Dorchester is the centre of employment for the area and needs more housing. I support the plans for a north of Dorchester Urban Extension.
- There are few jobs in the Dorchester area. This development will bring unemployed people and second home owners, both of which are undesirable.
- There is insufficient work for the additional population and successful businesses cannot be retained in the town.
- Young people want to live where there are high paying jobs and good amenities and facilities. This development will lead to soulless satellite suburbs to the already overstretched town.
- What is the point of building all of these homes if there are no jobs for younger people? It's just creating a second home / retiree ghetto without any sense of community.
- Will the jobs suggested be of high enough salary to enable the people to buy the properties that are to be built?
- The scale of development is better suited to the Bournemouth / Poole conurbation where there are greater employment opportunities.

- People take a wage cut in return for living in such a nice area – there are not enough well paid jobs.
- I do not believe the proposed development will achieve the plan's expressed aspirations for people of Dorchester present and future.
- I agree with the provision of homes for local people. However, the area already has a high proportion of people in employment in low paid sectors. Will need to control who buys the properties.
- As there are few jobs in the town the people moving to the town are retired or buying second homes.
- Is the housing to provide for a growing workforce and if so where are these jobs going to come from?

### **Comments about the Creation of a Community Spirit**

- A community identifying with Dorchester and all that the Frome Valley landscape and town has to offer is needed. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The development would not become a cohesive part of Dorchester due to the separation resulting from the water meadows.
- The planned settlement is an independent entity and not connected in any way to Dorchester.
- The development would only attract a single social group and therefore not create a mixed community.
- Concern over how a community spirit will be built? How will a cohesive community spirit be developed with Dorchester as a whole? What kind of workspaces will be provided and how will these be integrated with existing sites?
- Delivering development at smaller settlements would enable new residents to integrate into existing communities rather than being placed in soulless housing estates.
- If the area could be developed as a single community rather than three separate areas a community spirit could be established around new community facilities.
- The town has a sense of community which is helped by the fact that the young people are able to belong to the same secondary school. Such an enormous development would remove this.
- The site is unconnected from Dorchester due to the flood plain, therefore it is impossible to integrate into the town.
- The geographical and physical barrier between Dorchester and the new development will inevitably create divisions.
- Will people want to live in this remote suburb across the water meadows from Dorchester?
- It is very good that Dorchester is expanding as it is a lovely town to live in.

### **Comments about Water Resources**

- Source protection zone (2) is located to the north of Dorchester to protect groundwater used for drinking water. We are concerned that development in the area may result in hydrological impacts including potential loss of recharge to the water supply. Need to undertake a hydrological review to fully understand the implications for the drinking water supply. (Wessex Water)
- Any development proposals should be required to demonstrate that they do not compromise groundwater and its abstraction. A hydrological risk assessment should be undertaken which must demonstrate that the proposal (including construction phase) poses either no risk to groundwater and the aquifer(s) feeding the water source or that any risk can be successfully mitigated. (Wessex Water)
- The area around Eagle House Lodge is the catchment for Dorchester's water supply. More detail is needed on how the development will protect the environment around Dorchester and the downstream habitat.
- Water is already in short supply in this area. Future population increase will be detrimental to the River Frome resulting in a loss of native wildlife, plants and animals.
- Poundbury necessitated the search for new water resources and there is no mention of how water resources for the new development will be sourced.
- Part of the development is within a Ground Water Source Zone with a danger of pollution from the development.
- There will be an irreversible impact on the hydrology of the area which supplies water to the bore-hole for the existing community.

### **General Comments**

- The current nature of the Water Meadows should be maintained. No buildings or visitor centres are required and would be strongly opposed as they would destroy the natural feel to the area. (Charminster Parish Council)
- There is no evidence that the local development industry is capable of delivering the proposed housing numbers. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- Concern that Dorchester gets 3,500 homes but none of the benefits – including affordable homes. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The scheme takes out prime agricultural land and there are other smaller areas of poorer land around the town. It is short sighted to use farm land when we are being encouraged to grow more food to reduce imports.
- Post Brexit the uncertainty of food production will increase the necessity for good agricultural land. Developing it would be very short sighted.
- Post Brexit there will be a greater need for agricultural land.
- The appeal of Dorset to visitors and many residents is its countryside and coast, its smaller scale towns and villages, the importance of its farming and food production, arts and crafts and the opportunity for greener lifestyles.

Dorchester is not one of those commuter-belt towns of the south-east. Developments like this could severely damage the Dorset 'brand'.

- Development will damage the water meadows popular with residents and visitors.
- Countryside is important for food production, carbon storage, flood prevention and soil protection. It is important for everyone.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if mitigation will prevent no adverse impacts on the surrounding environment.
- Development will have a negative impact on the environment and proposals from the developer will do little to ameliorate this.
- All public lighting on the site must be non-light-polluting to ensure that residents retain a view of the night sky.
- Significant threat of light, land and air pollution.
- Concern over light pollution.
- Will access arrangements be useable by all protected characteristic groups mentioned in the Equality Act 2010?
- Not aware of any social or environmental impact assessments that have been undertaken for the site.
- A full environmental risk assessment must be undertaken – flood risk, biodiversity impact, ground water protection.
- Development would put extra strain on already stretched public goods: air quality, water resource, access to the countryside.
- It would be better to relocate some employment to Weymouth to reduce commuting and to aid with much needed regeneration.
- The loss of the water meadows would impact on tourism.
- There are ancient trees within the area.
- People who work in Dorchester will not necessarily move from Weymouth. Houses are cheaper in Weymouth and the seaside is an attractor.
- The elderly demographic of Dorchester has created a service consuming economy sucking workers into the town creating traffic congestion. Allocating more employment land will create more inward traffic movements.
- Many people in Poundbury drive to work as local people cannot afford to live and work in the town.
- Dorchester is becoming a dormitory town for Poole / Bournemouth.
- Do not add more pressure on the town centre through development.
- Who will run the new facilities when wages are relatively low and house prices are high. This is something that will not be altered by building the development.
- We are supposed to be caring for our environment rather than covering it in concrete and brick.
- The impacts of development on the surrounding area need to be carefully considered.
- The existing roads through Charminster and into Dorchester should remain as they are to retain their character and natural beauty.

### **Suggested alternative approaches to the development / development strategy**

- Housing numbers for Dorchester could be spread around nearby villages thereby sustaining their facilities. There is no sign that this option has been considered. (Dorchester Town Council)
- North Woodsford site (Crossways) has not been given the same amount of attention as North Dorchester. The main reason is the landowner's willingness to see their land developed. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The allocation will not result in an enhancement of the Dorchester area. It is a lost opportunity to overcome problems in and around the town. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- The important functional relationship of the town with Weymouth is not recognised. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- There is no basis or justification for the distribution of homes across the plan area. There has been insufficient regard to the option of developing at Crossways and other settlements within the vicinity of Dorchester. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- There is no analysis of the relationship of Dorchester with surrounding towns and villages and how connectivity between these places (Weymouth and Crossways in particular) can be improved. (Dorchester Civic Society)
- Proposing a large development as a potential new settlement north of the railway line in Crossways is an alternative to North Dorchester. The proposal would comprise of: circa 4,000 new homes; approximately 269ha of green infrastructure, including open space, and new and improved biodiversity habitats; a new mixed-use local centre with a range of services and facilities, retail and leisure provision, and employment floorspace; primary and secondary school provision; and an enhanced public transport offer, including the relocation and enhancement of Moreton Station. (Woodsford Farms)
- A high-level assessment of landscape and heritage sensitivity of broad areas does not allow for further more detailed analysis of the areas rejected. (LVA: South West LLP)
- There is a lack of consideration of issues such as access and accessibility. Development should be along the railway lines.
- The development will become a new village on the outskirts of the town.
- Even if there is a need for more homes, they should be put in the most sustainable locations and not just where landowners are willing to develop.
- All brownfield sites should be developed first.
- The evidence for the 2015 plan ruled out North Dorchester and this has not changed. The council should challenge the Inspector's recommendations.
- Other policies such as increase in council tax for second homes, increased use of brownfield land, more use of compulsory purchase, more funding for housing associations, would yield more benefits to the housing market and remove the influence away from land owners and property developers towards local people.

- The Local Plan states that development outside of DDBs is generally considered unsustainable. This is true for the proposed development north of Dorchester.
- Poundbury has already spoilt and dominates the landscape to the west of the town so this area should be the focus for future development.
- My preferred option would be for development in a less scenic part of the UK if no other choice to be spread across Dorset.
- The aim of the Council should be to protect rural areas from large scale development and instead provide little pockets of new housing in sensitively sourced locations especially on brownfield sites.
- There is no justification for 3,500 dwellings. It suggests a ploy to achieve a 'northern bypass' regardless of what is appropriate in the landscape. The council should limit development to an extension to Charminster or consider a new settlement.
- Small scale development at villages would require an analysis of landscape and heritage impact but there are sufficient sites around.
- A preferable location would be to the west of Poundbury where the landscape has already been affected.
- This would result in the destruction of the countryside between Dorchester and the AONB. Development should be spread across the area and not focused on Dorchester.
- The council should expand existing social housing projects across the county to provide for young families.
- If the total number of houses is really needed, then have more sites with a smaller number of houses on each.
- Silverlake has been described as a 'tax efficient way to build a second home'. This area should be used for affordable homes for local people rather than digging up greenfield sites such as North Dorchester.
- Dorchester has had enough development over recent years. If development is necessary in West Dorset then it should be directed towards towns that have had little development such as Beaminster, Sherborne and Bridport.
- Population increase per head of existing population will be greatest in Dorchester and Chickerell. The housing should be spread around to reduce this disproportionate impact.
- The area appears as though it could deliver 9,000 homes if built at the same density as Poundbury. Alternative locations and scale of development have not been properly considered.
- Major development elsewhere would preserve the character and heritage of this historic county town for future generations and visiting tourists.
- Development north of Coker's Frome Road further up the slope, would be a better location for development and would not irrevocably change the nature of Charminster and Stinsford villages.
- The council should look at how growth can be accommodated across the whole new unitary authority in an innovative way, including new garden communities

linked to existing settlements with good quality transport links and protecting the architectural, historic and community integrity of Dorchester.

- Development at Crossways would not have the same traffic problems.
- The Crossways proposal would be essentially a development on brownfield land associated with the old quarry working with little heritage or landscape value.
- Crossways sites would include social housing, open space, shops, supermarket and other amenities and will turn Crossways from a place lacking social amenities into a cohesive and proper functioning small town that will complement Dorchester.
- The alternative option of North of Crossways should be considered before damage is done north of Dorchester.
- Crossways is less than 6 miles from Dorchester which is not significantly different to the 1 to 2 miles from the northern edge of North Dorchester.
- New homes should be sited on land currently used for minerals extraction north of the railway line at Upper Woodsford, Crossways.
- The development is separated from Dorchester by the water meadows and should be planned as a new town or relocated elsewhere where there is less environmental harm such as Crossways which has been blighted by minerals extraction for years.
- The Crossways site would be within easy reach of Dorchester and beyond by train and by road.
- Now that the new Council is being formed, the opportunity exists to see if the development could be more evenly distributed across a wider area or concentrated in a new town / village.
- The alternative approach of a garden town south of Yeovil and Sherborne on flat land with little landscape impact, easy access to transport links to London, Bristol / Bath and the south west should be considered.
- Consider Upper Burton Farm as an alternative. It is hidden like Charlton Down. This will protect Dorchester's green spaces, views and water meadows.
- It is suggested that the area to the south and west of Poundbury would be more appropriate for development.
- Other options, such as brownfield land or other settlements, have not been fully explored.
- Comparison with other options for growth has not been evident.
- Poundbury, still far from completion already pushes infrastructure and facilities to the limit while surrounding villages continue to decline into retirement ghettos crying out for affordable housing to support schools and pubs etc.
- Development to the north of the town will do nothing for the cohesiveness that is needed for the town. Development to the south and east would offer opportunities to develop a more connected town.
- Encouraging people to move to Dorchester from the surrounding villages will leave ghost villages full of second home owners.

- Object to North Dorchester. Rather than creating considered complimentary increases in development, commensurate with the hamlets, villages, and towns (thereby keeping the character and separation of these individual locales), a panic creation of a 'new' village or town is suggested.
- Small clusters of housing in villages will enable more small scale local builders.
- Villages such as Bincombe and Martinstown should grow.
- The council should build homes specifically for young people with each settlement taking around 10% growth. Developers would need to be content with a smaller profit.
- Spread development across a larger number of settlements which are looking to grow through infilling.
- Housing could be delivered through small scale developments at each village through barn conversions and small scale unobtrusive developments.
- There are many small villages that would benefit from small levels of expansion.
- Support local communities to bring forward their own growth to enable organic growth of the town or village.
- Dispersed growth will reduce the instances of antisocial behaviour often associated with high density development.
- Should focus development around the south of the town where facilities already exist.
- Smaller scale development spread around Dorset would be more appropriate and would enable the county to retain its appeal and foster a greater sense of community reducing the incidence of anti-social behaviour and crime.
- There is a need to develop a 'Greater Dorchester' plan which looks at the interrelationship of settlements within the vicinity of the town.
- Full assessment of opportunities within Dorchester has not been undertaken.
- Preference for dispersal of growth around Dorset will enable the county to retain its unique and attractive character enabling other towns and villages to grow organically and thrive.
- The council should promote the organic and manageable growth of housing which could be achieved by infilling between existing properties along existing roads: small scale admittedly, but also low impact.

**Responses to Question 11-iii - New Policy DOR16 proposes housing development on land to the west of Charminster. Do you have any comments on new Policy DOR16?**

**Paragraph 11.6.4**

- No further development of the village should be permitted that could increase traffic to East Hill and West Hill, which are wholly unsuitable for further traffic.

**DOR16 i): Support for the Allocation**

- I live in Charminster and fully support the DOR16 proposal as described.

- Support development to the south of Wanchard Lane.
- Wyatt Homes strongly support the allocation of their land. The site is a very sustainable location well related to the existing settlement. It is in close proximity to a range of employment, services and facilities with access onto the highway network, public transport and walking / cycling routes. (Wyatt Homes)
- We strongly believe in delivering high-quality homes for local people to meet local needs. The development of the site is a logical extension to the village of Charminster which will complement the growth of Dorchester. (Wyatt Homes)
- Support the allocation of growth to Charminster which is a very sustainable location given its connections to Dorchester and the wide variety of facilities and services available there. (Wilson Enterprises Limited)
- We support the proposal to develop land west and north of Charminster, including the land within our ownership between Wanchard Lane and Drakes Lane. We believe that there is further land available and suitable for development to the north of the proposed allocation (i.e. further north to Drakes Lane and possibly beyond). This is a 'holding representation' made by the existing owners following a recently concluded marketing exercise for land north of Charminster, including a portion of the DOR16 Preferred Option. A 'preferred purchaser' has been selected. (Miss O A Miles dec'd)
- Development west of Charminster could be acceptable subject to the agreement of several details.
- Development of the scale envisaged could be acceptable provided that all housing is built to Passiv-Haus standards as a minimum.
- Development in this location could be acceptable if there was to be no more development once this was built.

**DOR16 i): Objections to the Allocation – Options at Dorchester / North Dorchester**

- Concern that Charminster is being absorbed into a greater Dorchester with no thought being given to the requirements of existing property owners.
- In considering meeting the future growth options at Dorchester the councils have considered all options for growth around Dorchester, in the knowledge that there is limited capacity within the town's physical boundaries of the bypass and the River Frome. (LVA South West LLP)
- There has been a complete lack of consideration of brownfield land within Dorchester therefore development in Charminster is the result.
- DOR16 is outside of the defined development boundary. We note that this preferred option is denoted DOR16 (with 'DOR' referring to Dorchester) and seek assurance that this is not indicative of a policy for Charminster to effectively become part of Dorchester. (West Dorset CPRE)
- Additional capacity is built into the North Dorchester site over the plan period, therefore why is development needed at Charminster?

#### **DOR16 i): Objections to the Allocation – Options at Charminster**

- Object to development on the north side of Wanchard Lane.
- Charminster has already tolerated the development of Charlton Down and at Charminster Farm with more homes proposed.
- The LVA land (Westleaze) in combination with surrounding land would have been a clear alternative to land to the west of Charminster. LVA objects to the Council's preferred site selections. (LVA South West LLP)
- If the Westleaze appeal is successful we believe that this would be an important reason to reject DOR16 as both developments together would be grossly out of scale to the current settlement. (West Dorset CPRE)
- We believe that DOR16 is out of scale to the village of Charminster, with this being obvious by glancing at the provided map. The distinctiveness of the village would be adversely changed in conflict with the fourth 'stated priority' and policy ENV12. (West Dorset CPRE)
- The Council should only enhance the infrastructure of existing settlements through carefully considered small scale development within the village confines rather than transform them into conurbations.

#### **DOR16 i): Objections to the Allocation – Options across the Local Plan Area**

- If additional growth is required it would be more appropriate and sustainable to spread this across the whole of West Dorset and not just in / around the Dorchester area. Development at Crossways, Bridport, Beaminster, Lyme Regis and Sherborne should be allocated as well as in Weymouth and Portland.
- Lack of services and transport links should not be used as an excuse for avoiding more widespread development throughout the area. These services should be improved to allow the housing provision to be more widely spread and to help reinvigorate rural communities. (Macmillan Cancer Support)

#### **DOR16 ii): Mix of Housing / Tenures**

- Homes for sale in the local area all appear to be at a price that many local people cannot afford.
- There is little evidence to suggest that the development would address local affordability issues.
- The houses being sold on Charminster Farm site are for £450,000. How does this help local first time buyers?
- There is a need to ensure compliance with other policies in the plan especially HOUS3 – House Types and Sizes. (Dorchester Town Council)
- The proposals are acceptable provided there is no relaxation of the affordable homes requirement. We all know the games developers play and this is absolutely not on.
- There are few jobs in the Dorchester area. This will bring unemployed people, retirees and second home owners to the area.

### **DOR16 iii): Improved Access off the A37**

- Support this proposal subject to a new entrance onto the Yeovil road.
- A new junction can be provided onto Wanchard Lane on land within Wyatt Homes control. Development could also include a new through route between the A37 and Wanchard Lane creating a link with the consented development allowing traffic to access the DOR16 site without passing through the village. (Wyatt Homes)
- The Parish Council feels strongly that the improved access onto the A37 should be created early on in the development. There should be no further development in this area, after Phase 2 of Charminster Farm is complete, until this new access road / junction is completed. (Charminster Parish Council)
- The new junction onto the A37 should be provided before there is any additional development at Charminster.
- Generally support development which does not increase pressure on the existing village and is accessed via A37.
- Weir View should be traffic calmed to address road safety with maybe exit only onto the A37.
- The reduced area at Charminster Farm will possibly curtail the improvements to Wanchard Lane and alternative access to the A37.
- A green buffer should be included along the A37 to screen the development from traffic noise.

### **DOR16 iv): Frome Valley Trail / Cycleways**

- There is a need to provide high quality walking links to the Frome Valley Trail and contribute towards improved public transport infrastructure near the site. (Dorset County Council: Transport)
- Support the suggestion of improvements to cycle routes and the enhancement of the Frome Valley Trail but Wyatt Homes are only able to deliver schemes on land within their control. Willing to contribute towards cycle routes to promote healthy lifestyles. (Wyatt Homes)
- The proposed extension to the Frome Valley Trail will harm the character of the water meadows.
- In order to encourage cycle usage, routes must be safe, continuous, direct and avoid hills.

### **DOR16 v): Impact on the Dorset AONB / Landscape**

- Natural England welcomes the more limited allocation and policy requirement for softening the landscape impacts of a development on the Dorset AONB. Provided the Dorset AONB Team are satisfied that the preferred allocation is acceptable in relation to the setting of the Dorset AONB then Natural England would have no objection. (Natural England)
- Concerned that the land to the west of the Charminster Depot could create a prominent, elevated building line. The indicative layout shows the developable

- area with the land to the south of the lane tapering toward the depot, the benefits of this approach would be partly negated if the developable area to the north of the road is to extend westward to the extent that has been indicated, without sufficient mitigation. Increasing the amount of space envisaged for landscaping to the north of the road, along the western edge, is advisable as this would foreseeably help to contain the apparent spread of development along the ridgeline, when viewed from the AONB. (Dorset AONB)
- It would be beneficial to ensure that the approach advocated by the indicative layout for the further western extension is maintained. This would result in further future development being seen to sit below phase 2. Although there would be some increase in the visual impact of urban housing development, particularly due to the greater mass of housing development along the western edge of Charminster, this intensification would be partly offset through the provision of a sizable amount of open space and planting. (Dorset AONB)
  - Proposed strategic landscaping along a section of the developable area should extend around the entire boundary of the open space as well. (Charminster Parish Council)
  - Support this proposal subject to recognition of current village allotment provision, planting of a screen / boundary of trees on the development's western edge.
  - Beautiful landscape will be harmed by developments – Charlton Down, Hayden Hill, Charminster Farm and Poundbury.
  - Strategic Landscaping associated with DOR16 could be provided north of Drakes Lane and not create any unacceptable impacts on the wider landscape or AONB. (Wilson Enterprises Limited)
  - The area to the west of DOR16 within Wyatt Homes' control should not be excluded but a landscape led approach to defining the edge of the development should be used. Recognise the importance that the development does not cause landscape harm but there is an opportunity for further cohesive development well related to Charminster. (Wyatt Homes)
  - Land to the south of Wanchard Lane includes the substantial provision of retained agricultural land, informal open space and structure planting. The transition from agricultural land, through informal open space and new tree and hedgerow planting to the proposed development, would ensure a soft edge to the village and minimise the change to the setting of the AONB. (Wyatt Homes)
  - The rural character of Charminster will be destroyed.
  - It would be a blot on the landscape and stick out like a sore thumb.

**DOR16 vi): Impact on Heritage Assets**

- Hardy heritage and culture will be sacrificed – it must be stopped.
- The combined effect of the extension to Charminster along with Poundbury will be detrimental to heritage assets in the area such as Poundbury Hillfort.

### **Infrastructure: General**

- Support as long as some additional facilities are provided – football ground, play areas for older children, tennis courts, new access onto the Yeovil road – should be decided through engagement with the parish council.
- The Local Plan should show how the Charminster extension should be developed to provide allotments, playing fields, sports facilities and social housing regardless of land ownership.
- The development will put too much strain on the facilities within Dorchester.

### **Infrastructure: Allotments**

- The proposed area includes the allotments adjacent to the A37. These are the only allotments in the village and need protecting.
- If allotments are reduced, replacements are needed.
- Allotments create a sound barrier to the A37.

### **Infrastructure: Cemetery**

- Developing up to the edge of the graveyard will restrict its capacity. Surely with more people living in the area, more people will die needing more space.
- Land must be allocated for the extension of the cemetery. People will die and prefer to be buried locally.
- Consideration should be given to long term burial needs of the community.

### **Infrastructure: Education**

- There needs to be explicit mention of contributions towards the development of the educational infrastructure (3 tier) based on the prevailing rates at the time which may include contributions towards nursery and special educational needs provision. (Dorset County Council: Children's Services)
- Schools in Dorchester and Charminster are at capacity.

### **Infrastructure: Health**

- Doctors and the hospital in Dorchester are at capacity and there are no plans to expand them.
- Developers should be required to provide improved facilities such as a GP surgery. (Charminster Parish Council)

### **Infrastructure: Open Space / Recreation**

- Areas of open space should include a sports field and a tennis court to provide adequate facilities for Charminster. (Charminster Parish Council)
- Strawberry Fields should be designated as a recreation area.

### **Infrastructure: Water Supply**

- Our service records indicate that there are multiple distribution mains within the boundary of the site. Statutory easements apply and this will impact on site layout and the density of development which may be achieved. (Wessex Water)
- Sewers in the area are already old - will they be renewed?

### **Transport**

- Too many homes are proposed in one area and the roads cannot cope with the current traffic.
- The size of this site and the overall level of growth at Dorchester has the potential to have a significant impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and there is a requirement for mitigation measures to support this growth. (Highways England)
- Road changes will have a devastating detrimental effect on existing residents with heavy reliance on the car to use even basic facilities.
- The policy retains the separate identity of Charminster. However it also requires facilitating ease of travel to Dorchester. These aims seem incompatible. (Dorchester Town Council)
- Narrow and twisty roads in the village are a danger for pedestrians and school children walking up West Hill.
- There is an aspiration to create a footpath along North Street on land proposed within the developed area between Wanchard Lane towards Higher Charminster to allow for safe pedestrian access through the village, as supported by the Local Transport Plan. (Charminster Parish Council)
- The proposed development on Strawberry Fields will cause traffic danger. The previous refusal should be upheld.
- Developers should be required to provide an improved bus service. (Charminster Parish Council)
- All existing on-street parking in Charminster must be equipped with lo-rate electric vehicle charge points at the expense of the developers to make the development acceptable.

### **Biodiversity / Habitats**

- We recommend that a clause is added to the policy, or supporting text, requiring any necessary mitigation measures to secure nutrient neutrality in relation to the Poole Harbour international sites. (Natural England)
- It is important that any development here does not cause any adverse impacts on the grassland of Charminster cemetery, particularly through pollution or run-off both during building works and the operational stage, also through dust during the building stage. This site contains grassland which supports an exceptional population of waxcap fungi. DWT recommends that a buffer of greenspace between any housing and the cemetery is incorporated into the plan. (Dorset Wildlife Trust)

### **Design / Amenity**

- Concern over loss of views, loss of sun, overlooking and harm to amenity.
- High density development is not a good idea in this location.

### **Loss of Agricultural Land**

- There would be a loss of agricultural land that contributes to our food supply.

### **Flooding**

- The proposal is located in a groundwater flood risk area where there is a high risk of foul sewer inundation during periods of prolonged wet weather leading to sewer flooding. We will be working with the LLFA to implement a groundwater management strategy and will be seeking to ensure that the proposed drainage is resilient to the impacts of groundwater infiltration when the water table rises. (Wessex Water)
- The land is a flood plain and floods.

### **Mineral Safeguarding**

- The site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (Sand and Gravel). Would expect assessment and prior extraction of this resource. (Dorset County Council: Minerals and Waste)

## **Omission Site: Castle Park Strip, Dorchester**

### **Amenity**

- A noise assessment has been undertaken which demonstrates that it is possible to develop the site within acceptable noise limits.

### **Flooding**

- Low risk of fluvial flooding, eastern edge at risk of pluvial flooding. Concern that elevated groundwater levels combined with inadequate downstream infrastructure would require off-site attenuated discharge. There are a number of viable off-site solutions which could reduce flood risk for existing properties.

### **Landscape**

- The site is well-related to southern boundary of Dorchester and enclosed by tree belts associated with the A35. It would be screened visually from Maiden Castle due to boundary trees.

### **Transport**

- A highways assessment indicates capacity for around 225 dwellings accessed off B2147 (to the east) with secondary access from Maiden Castle Road (to the west) plus pedestrian and cycle routes to existing residential areas.