

Broadwindsor Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Plan Representation Summary

Broadwindsor Parish Council submitted their final version of the Broadwindsor Neighbourhood Plan (2018) to West Dorset District Council for independent examination in December 2018. People were given eight weeks from Wednesday 12th December 2018 until the end of Wednesday 6th February 2019 to comment on the content of the plan or how it was produced. At the close of the public consultation eight representations were received. A further representation from Historic England has been received late after the close of the consultation.

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
1	Mr A Fry	<p><u>Land to East of Manor Farm Drimpton</u></p> <p>Concerns regarding the potential layout of development particularly any dwellings or the road as it would need to minimise impact on our nearby property. Management of surface water drainage on the site would need to be carefully considered. Proposed footpath on this site would terminate on to busy B3162 making it dangerous for pedestrians.</p> <p><u>Appendix</u></p> <p>An undated letter submitted to the draft plan consultation is attached.</p>
2	Mr Harris	<p><u>Land East of Netherhay Lane</u></p> <p>The proposed development east of Netherhay Lane, does not have the support of the residents of Drimpton and Netherhay. It has been a contentious development for years, and proceeding with it would have an entirely negative impact on the rural Netherhay Lane, as well as the village as a whole. The number of houses is not in keeping with local demand, and does not offer young residents the services or employment opportunities they would need.</p> <p><u>Appendix</u></p> <p>A previous response to the draft Plan dated 22 June 2018 is attached.</p> <p><u>Previous comments</u></p> <p>The amount of houses in Drimpton should be reduced to 25% as per the survey</p> <p>Site sizes should be limited to 5 dwellings</p> <p>Site 7a be deemed unsuitable and should be removed from the plan</p> <p>Site 14 should be changed to a mixed use development</p>
3	Mr S Sach	<p><u>Land East of Netherhay Lane</u></p> <p>Objection to the proposed development of Land to the East of Netherhay Lane, Drimpton. The land is poorly drained. Netherhay Lane is totally unsuitable to accommodate an additional volume of traffic. Access to and from the lane is hazardous with sight lines which are very limited. The lane its self has no passing places and difficult for two vehicles</p>

Broadwindsor Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – February 2019

		<p>to pass one another. Over the years this lane has become an amenity for dog walkers, joggers and walkers. This amenity would be severely damaged if development was allowed. Drimpton has no shop and virtually no employment prospects.</p> <p>Over 40 houses were built some few years ago and additional development is not wanted and not necessary. A very few years ago a petition rejected development of this Green Field Site.</p> <p>This development would damage the fabric of the village and break the convention of not allowing development to link separate small communities. (Netherhay & Drimpton)</p>
4	JG Watts	<p>Netherhay Lane is a valuable facility within the village and should be retained as such.</p> <p>The gap between Drimpton and Netherhay should be retained. The gap should be the whole field as at present.</p> <p>Development in Drimpton is not considered to be sustainable. More affordable housing within the village cannot be sustained. The village has few facilities and residents are reliant on private transport.</p> <p>Development should not be suggested where it is not sustainable and in an AONB</p> <p>Site 7a should be taken out of the plan</p> <p>Axe Mill should be considered for mixed use development</p> <p><u>Appendix</u></p> <p>A previous letter to the Parish Council dated 15th July 2018 is attached.</p>
5	Mr N G Adams	<p><u>Land East of Netherhay Lane</u></p> <p>Objection to the proposed development of Land to the East of Netherhay Lane, Drimpton.</p> <p>The proposed development is located in the Dorset AONB and would result in the loss of a hedgerow.</p> <p>Netherhay lane is attracting more traffic, some in excess of the weight limit currently imposed. The lane has a speed limit of 60mph. The lane is narrow and boarded with ancient tress and hedges.</p> <p>The need for direct access by more traffic onto Netherhay Lane could become a risk to pedestrians and road traffic.</p> <p>The lane which is an integral part of a circular walk for dog walkers, runners, horse riders and ramblers is very popular, and additional traffic could present an increase in risk to pedestrians as well as causing difficulties to a rise in two-way traffic.</p> <p>The lack of infrastructure, and without mains drainage, should have eliminated this site at the start. The inclusion of a sewage treatment plant is badly sited so close to neighbouring property, and raises the potential for ground contamination or pollution.</p> <p>The amenities in the village for a young family are very limited particularly without the provision of a shop. The Royal Oak Public House too, is restricted in size. There are other amenities provided at the Village Hall coupled with a range</p>

		<p>of playground equipment.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan shows an area set aside to separate Drimpton from Netherhay, which ideally should be the field itself. If accepted as an ‘exception’ area for low cost housing, the owner of the field is bound to seek planning permission for additional housing. I understand that ‘exception areas’ are set by the local authority and varies in accordance with the demand for housing. This field has been submitted for planning permission a number of times, and has consistently been refused, presumably because it is located in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Young families require employment opportunities, schools and shops all of which are limited locally and so require transport to meet these necessities.</p> <p>It is recognised that Low Cost Housing is an important issue, but in this case I feel that the pressure to produce results has failed to recognise that this piece of land is so problematic for development, it should have been rejected before going to the trouble and expense of carrying out land surveys and producing plans.</p> <p><u>Alternative exception site</u></p> <p>A more suitable site for low cost housing would be the Axe site which has the infrastructure and access ensuring lower costs and a safer environment.</p>
6	Wood E&I Solutions UK Ltd On behalf of National Grid	<p>National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate and High-Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>
7	South West Water	We have no specific comments.
8	West Dorset District Council	<p><u>Planning context</u></p> <p>We would suggest that the reference to development being focused in the larger village of Broadwindsor is clarified further within the supporting text as its currently looks as though there are more sites have been allocated in Drimpton than in Broadwindsor.</p> <p><u>Maps</u></p> <p>The district council is happy to work with the parish council to produce higher quality maps to ensure that the detail on each can clearly be understood.</p>

		<p><u>Policies</u></p> <p><u>Policy BGNP4A Local Wildlife and Corridors and Protected species</u></p> <p>An additional policy BGNP4A Local Wildlife Corridors and Protected Species has been added to address comments from the Natural Environment Team at DCC (see paragraph 11.3 of the Submission Stage SEA). However we would question the need for the reference to 0.1ha in relation to the submission of Biodiversity and Mitigation Plan</p> <p><u>Policy BGNP5. Important Gaps</u></p> <p>The map that accompanies the policy is not clear. The linear notation makes it difficult to identify exactly which areas are included, how far back from the road they would be and whether the policy applies to both sides. In addition, the length of the gaps marked in a yellow dashed line are too extensive.</p> <p>The policies maps later on in the document shows some open gap areas in more detail however not all the areas marked in red on the Assessment of Settlements and Measured Gaps plan are shown in this way.</p> <p>The Council recommends that all open gaps are shown on the Policies Map. The gaps marked in yellow should be shortened as the majority of these areas would be protected by the AONB. The fragile areas marked by a red dot should be defined in more detail.</p> <p>Conflict between site allocations and gaps policy should be clarified to avoid any confusion.</p> <p><u>Policy BGNP8.Meeting the areas housing needs</u></p> <p>Both the supporting text Para 5.3 and 5.8 and policy refers to ‘about 4 to 5 dwellings’. This should be amended to “<i>at least 4 dwellings per annum</i>”.</p> <p>The policy makes specific reference to “<i>starter homes</i>”. The Council suggests this is amended to “<i>homes for first time buyers</i>”.</p> <p>In relation to the approval of larger homes the policy specifies the need for additional justification and the ability for the dwelling to be subdivided. Whilst additional justification may be feasible the ability for the dwelling to be subdivided may not be a practical requirement. The Parish Council may wish reconsider this point.</p> <p><u>Locations for sustainable growth and site specific allocations</u></p> <p>There is existing permission for up to 22 houses at Land South of Fullers Bridport Road however it is noted in the Neighbourhood Plan that the capacity has been assessed by the Neighbourhood plan group as significantly less (around 10). Notwithstanding that the permission for Land South of Fullers Bridport Road WD/D/17/000800 has already been issued for 22 dwellings.</p> <p>This has a significant impact on <i>Table 5. Potential sites for inclusion – outcomes</i> and we would recommend that the text and table is amended to reflect this.</p>
--	--	---

		<p><u>Policy BGNP10 Site 1: Land to the South of Fullers, opposite Redlands Lane: Housing</u> The description should include the larger scheme for 22 houses and description should reflect the Planning Permission granted.</p> <p><u>Policy BGNP11 Site 3: Land at Manor Farm Common Water Lane Broadwindsor</u> The Conservation Officer has assessed this site and agrees with the site assessment. There is a grade II listed building in close proximity to the site and its setting may be affected if the existing buildings on site are replaced or increased in height. As such the Conservation Officer considers there to be a negative impact on heritage, however it is noted that there is an additional requirement for a Heritage Assessment has been added to the policy.</p> <p><u>BGNP14: Site 7a Land East of Netherhay Lane Drimpton</u> Whilst the site has been reduced and now does not extend across the entire width of the field we are still concerned that development in this area would be closing an important gap between the settlement of Drimpton and Netherhay. Much will depend on the design of the scheme and how much of the land is developed. The Conservation Officer has also commented that <i>“Development within this site would likely affect the setting of both listed buildings within Netherhay. It would also infill the historic gap between Drimpton and Netherhay and therefore removes any physical and visual gap between these settlements. If the entire site were development it would also significantly increase the settlement size and therefore impact upon the landscape character of the AONB in this area. A negative effect on Heritage has been allocated to this site in the scoring. This should really be a significant negative effect.”</i></p> <p><u>BGNP16: Site 5 Land at Brent Paddock Axe Lane Netherhay</u> There is concern that development on this site is likely to impact on the immediate setting of the Grade II listed Methodist Chapel. A neutral effect on heritage has been allocated to this site during in the site assessment. The Conservation Officer disagrees with this assessment and has commented that <i>“This should be negative due to the impact on the setting of the chapel”</i>. It is noted that there is now a requirement for a Heritage Assessment. As such the Council suggests that additional justification is added to the supporting text outlining the Conservation Officers concerns and highlighting the need for a heritage assessment.</p> <p><u>BGNP17: Site 14 Land at Axe Mill, Netherhay</u> Some concerns have been raised by the Conservation Officer in relation to this site. Whilst the policy does seek to retain the hedgerow <i>‘and retain the hedgerow as far as practical’</i> there is concern that this hedgerow could be lost during development. If development is located to the south of the existing hedgerow on Axe Lane or if this hedgerow is removed, this is likely to impact the rural setting of the Grade II listed Methodist chapel. A neutral effect on heritage has been allocated to the site in the site assessment however if development is located south of the existing</p>
--	--	--

		<p>hedgerow on Axe Lane or if this hedgerow is removed, this site is likely to impact the rural setting of the Grade II listed Methodist Chapel.</p> <p>The wording of the policy should be strengthened to ensure that the hedgerow is retained or if it cannot be retained a replacement hedgerow should be planted.</p> <p><u>Compliance with EU obligations – requirement for Strategic Environmental Assessment</u></p> <p>Concerns raised at the Regulation 14 stage have been largely satisfied with additional text.</p>
--	--	--

Late

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
9	Historic England	<p><u>BGNP14: Site 7a Land East of Netherhay Lane Drimpton</u></p> <p>We have previously expressed a willingness to defer to the heritage expertise of the local planning authority but identified that there appeared to be a significant disconnect between the evidence that expertise had provided and the rationale for the policy (see attached correspondence).</p> <p>We recommended that further evidence/clarification be sought to demonstrate that an appropriate understanding of relevant heritage assets had informed the formulation of the policy and that an allocation in principle is suitable in terms of its conformity with overarching national and local planning policy, especially that for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>We urge you to determine definitively the extent to which the proposed site will in its in-principle allocation cause harm to designated heritage assets, the site’s suitability for what is proposed, and should allocation be deemed acceptable what criteria or mitigation measures will be necessary to ensure any harm is avoided or minimised to an acceptable degree.</p> <p><u>Appendices</u></p> <p>A series of emails discussing the draft Plan dated 1 September 2017, 4 December 2017, 30 July 2018 and 25 September 2018 are attached.</p>