

Askerswell Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Plan Representation Summary

Askerswell Neighbourhood Forum submitted their final version of the Askerswell Neighbourhood Plan (February 2018) to West Dorset District Council for independent examination in February 2018. People were given six weeks from Monday 12 March 2018 until the end of Monday 23 April 2018, to comment on the content of the plan or how it was produced. At the close of the public consultation 10 representations were received.

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
1	Alan Hussey	Few people on the steering group. Question legitimacy of the extent of the proposed Defined Development Boundary (DDB) agreed by a secret ballot. Object to revised DDB that omits previously considered site allocations. Conversely, some land within the revised DDB seems unsuitable. The steering group has an anti-development agenda. One of the plots is proposed on 'greensand' and unsuitable for foundations.
2	Graham & Gill Foot	Object to the exclusion of the plot of land between Greenacres Farm and Rocklea from the Neighbourhood Plan. Disagree with the Plan conclusion that the plot can be seen from The Spyway Inn or from the A35, the Plot would be suitable for low cost housing. Family has a close connection with Askerswell. The village is becoming a retirement village and needs further development to keep the village alive with a cross section of inhabitants giving new possibility for job creation.
3	Harriet Laurie	Concern with how the process of preparing the Plan has been run. Often felt intimidated. Unclear why the Plan changed in September 2017 whereby specific sites would be designated instead of relying on a Defined Development Boundary (DDB). Explanation given was that the original approach would allow too many houses. This change was rejected by the steering group. The Plan approach subsequently changed again to reduce the size of the DDB. Advice was to consult the whole village on this change instead the change was agreed by a ballot of members of the Forum only. Evidence for this approach is not considered accurate and was accompanied with threats of mass resignation should the preferred approach not be agreed. Proposed infill approach does not achieve the aim of the Plan which is to enable young people of the village to build homes and raise families. This aim survives in the Plan despite attempts to remove it. Family members have aspirations to continue to live in the village but are being denied. Proposed DDB does not support young families. Would like to see three excluded plots (Green Acre Farm, Coutt's field corner and land adjacent Knapp Cottages) reinstated to give more options for the young people who grew up in the village to return. There is no evidence to suggest a cap on the number of houses would not be effective. A larger DDB would be fairer. Concerned about personal 'witch hunt' directed against me including secret petitions, spread of disinformation about me (planning enforcement, parish / forum meetings and local MP) which have been proven untrue.

Askerswell Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – May 2018

4	Highways England	Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this instance consists of the A35 which forms the southern boundary of the plan area. Satisfied that the proposed plan policies are unlikely to result in development which will impact on the SRN and we therefore have no specific comments to make.
5	Historic England	<p>Can confirm that there are no issues associated with the Plan upon which we wish to comment.</p> <p>I attach our Regulation 14 consultation response for information.</p> <p><i>“There is in fact little upon which we would wish to comment. The Plan does not allocate sites for development, which is often a source of special interest for us. We are impressed by the depth and scope of understanding of the distinctive heritage qualities of the Plan area and the policies and proposals for their protection and enhancement.</i></p> <p><i>It therefore only remains for us to congratulate your community on its work to date and wish it well in getting the Plan made.”</i></p>
6	Marine Management Organisation	The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England’s marine area on behalf of the UK government. Standard response to Neighbourhood Plans attached.
7	Nick and Denise Collins	Object to the Plan because it fails to deliver what was agreed which was around 10 sites over the next ten year. The Hembury Road site is the most suitable as there is no flood risk, good road access, level ground and future development would be small matching infill. Felt unable to speak out in meetings. Felt views had no value. The majority of the board are not local people.
8	South Somerset District Council	Having read and duly considered the Plan, we have no comments to make.
9	Sport England	Sport England’s statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Standard response to Neighbourhood Plans attached.
10	West Dorset District Council	<p><u>General</u></p> <p>Plan period should be clearly presented on the front cover.</p> <p>Suggest that sub headings are included at the beginning of each new section.</p> <p>When making reference to the quantity of development expected, the phrase “around 4 to 5 dwellings” should be used rather than “up to” as the anticipated quantum of development should not be seen as an upper limit.</p>

		<p><u>Policy E1: Protection of Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u></p> <p>Paragraph 5.3 seeks to put specific (1km) parameters on the visibility of new buildings from the viewpoints. A qualitative assessment would be preferred such as “should not have a detrimental visual impact”. Amended wording suggested.</p> <p>Concerned Policy E1.1 seeks to “maintain” the qualities of the AONB. Prefer phrase “respect”. Amended wording suggested.</p> <p>Concerned Policy E1.2 refers to views that are distant and expansive rather than clearly defined and discrete. Views relate to the landscape context of the area and should be protected as landscape features rather than as distinct views. The only view listed that would fall within the context of a views policy is view e. of the crossroads.</p> <p><u>Policy E2: Protection of Special Landscape and Historic Features</u></p> <p>Policy E2 causes some concern. The policy supports development that would allow for the retention and enjoyment of the following features and their settings. It is unclear exactly what features are being protected by this policy as the range of features are extensive and wide ranging. Each of the special qualities of the features listed should be clearly described and where possible identified on a map. Where the features cannot be protected through the planning system, they should not be mentioned in the list. Where the special qualities relate to a landscape feature, these should be mentioned in a landscape policy. Multiple mentions of landscape features in views and special characteristic adds confusion and doesn’t enable clear decision making.</p> <p><u>Policy E3: Protection of Wildlife Habitats</u></p> <p>Policy E3.2 relates more closely to process rather than a policy requirement. It may be better suited to the supporting text.</p> <p><u>Policy E4: To Protect and Enhance the Character and Appearance of the Area</u></p> <p>Paragraph 5.8 lists a number of buildings of local importance. It is recommended that the curtilages of these locally important buildings are clearly outlined on a map. A map can be produced in consultation with the neighbourhood forum ready for inclusion in the made plan.</p> <p>Policy E4.1 and supporting table at Paragraph 5.10. The policy as it currently stands contains detail that is too prescriptive. The detailed requirements should be removed from the policy and placed within the preceding text or table. The policy itself should then make reference to this supporting text but be more general in its wording. The policy should make reference to high quality contemporarily designed modern buildings and extensions being acceptable. Amended wording suggested.</p>
--	--	--

Askerswell Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – May 2018

		<p><u>Policy B1: Local Employment and Business</u></p> <p>Typographical error</p> <p><u>Policy H1: Location of housing</u></p> <p>Paragraph 8.6 should be re-worded to make reference to ‘about 4 or 5 new dwellings’. Amended wording suggested.</p> <p><u>Proposals Map</u></p> <p>Several of the maps in the plan are difficult to interpret due to their quality. The council is happy to work with the Neighbourhood Forum to produce higher quality maps to ensure that the detail on each can clearly be understood.</p> <p><u>Compliance with EU obligations – requirement for Strategic Environmental Assessment</u></p> <p>Askerswell Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to require a full SEA.</p>
--	--	---

One late representation has been received.

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
11	Dorset AONB	<p>Apologies, I do not appear to have responded to the formal consultation.</p> <p>I attach our Regulation 14 consultation response for information.</p> <p><i>“Many thanks for providing me with a copy of your pre-submission draft and for your continued efforts in progressing this document. It is good to see that the Plan is comprehensively informed by considerations relating to the AONB designation. Overall, I can certainly say that in my opinion the document fully meets the statutory duty of regard to the purpose of the AONB designation, as established by the CRoW Act.</i></p> <p><i>I note the policies aimed to protect the character and appearance of the AONB and the proposed DDB. I consider the identified DDB area to reflect the landscape sensitivities that were discussed during the process of site assessment. The use of the DDB in the identified area has the potential to encourage an appropriate level of housing growth across an area where land can foreseeably be made available and where future development could complement the existing form of Askerswell.</i></p> <p><i>Consequently I am happy to give my support to this approach and to the policies that you have devised within the Plan.”</i></p>