

## Holwell Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Plan Representation Summary

Holwell Parish Council submitted their final version of the Holwell Neighbourhood Plan (2018) to West Dorset District Council for independent examination in August 2018. People were given six weeks from Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> September 2018 until the end of Friday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2018, to comment on the content of the plan or how it was produced. At the close of the public consultation 9 representations were received.

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
1	Malcolm Smith	<u>Land at Barton Farm</u> Objecting as the Land at Barton Farm has not been included within the Neighbourhood plan as a site for development
2	Hugh Watkins	In appendix 3 the Land at Crouch Lane is seen as backland. As part of this permission the construction of a public highway is proposed as such this should not be considered to be backland development.  In appendix 6 a site at the rear of The Plot is zoned as a reserve site for affordable homes. This is not considered to be less backland than my family's land. Development on my family's land should not be ruled out for the duration of the Neighbourhood plan.
3	Highways England	Satisfied that the plans proposed are unlikely to result in development which will impact on the highway network
4	Natural England	Natural England are pleased to see that some of the previous advice has been incorporated into the neighbourhood plan. As such there are no further comments to make.
5	WDDC comments	<u>General</u> There are no paragraph numbers  We would expect the supporting details of the policies to be included within the plan  Amendments to some of the maps are suggested to make the maps more user friendly  Housing growth and target report is quite complicated. There is also no definite target and the use of three potential targets is confusing.

		<p>Site assessment report is a complicated report but has been simplified as much as possible. There is a clear indication of how the sites were identified, the development of the assessment criteria and the public engagement at the various stages.</p> <p>Overall the supporting text for the plan is strong in setting out the context. However we would recommend that the supporting text for the Policy EB1 location for employment and business makes reference to the established building line and its importance in siting development.</p> <p><u>Policies</u></p> <p><u>Policy H1: Amount and location of New Housing</u></p> <p>We would suggest that the wording of the policy be reworded to say “at least 3 <i>new build, open market dwellings to be developed in Holwell during the Plan period (2031)</i>” rather than “up to” as the use of three targets numbers 3, 5 and 26 is confusing.</p> <p>The policy provides no guidance on the allocated sites. The sites are considered to be in keeping with the existing pattern and form of development in the area but it maybe useful to reference the site assessment report in the policy.</p> <p>As a point of clarification in response to Historic England’s comments the Conservation Officer did not comment on sites G and H because neither were within the setting of a listed building or scheduled monument and there is no Conservation Area in Holwell.</p> <p><u>Policy C1 Important Community facilities</u></p> <p>The policy could be strengthened to clarify further the preferred location of the “existing building” for example is there a village centre where community buildings are more accessible</p> <p><u>Policy E1 Locally Important Views</u></p> <p>The views are defined on the proposals map but cover wide areas especially V3. We would therefore suggest focusing the views further possibly restricting them to a point and splay.</p> <p><u>Compliance with EU obligations – requirement for Strategic Environmental Assessment</u></p> <p>The SEA screening exercise for the Holwell Neighbourhood Plan concluded that due to the scale of development being considered in the Holwell Neighbourhood plan in combination with that already having planning permission is</p>
--	--	---

Holwell Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Consultation Summary of Responses – October 2018

		unlikely to have significant effects on the environment and therefore a full SEA is not required in this instance.
6	Chris Protheroe	We object to the Holwell Neighbourhood plan on the basis that due process was not followed by the Parish Council during its own consultation process with residents, by failing to give reasonable motive or to publicise key public meetings and providing erroneous and misleading information on its website. We also object to the content of the plan and in particular the guideline policies concerning architectural styles which we believe will constrain innovation and encourage a safe pastiche style of building of a kind that is blighting so much of this country.
7	Katherine Protheroe	We object to the Holwell Neighbourhood plan on the basis that due process was not followed by the Parish Council during its own consultation process with residents, by failing to give reasonable motive or to publicise key public meetings and providing erroneous and misleading information on its website. We also object to the content of the plan and in particular the guideline policies concerning architectural styles which we believe will constrain innovation and encourage a safe pastiche style of building of a kind that is blighting so much of this country.
8	David Stuart Historic England	In our response to the Regulations 14 Consultation we drew attention to the need for clarification/ further evidence concerning the possible impact on heritage assets arising from the proposed site allocations under policy H1. Although not within this response, the proposed site allocation policy H3 should also have embraced these comments. Though it has been involved in the site assessment process, we indicated the desirability of securing clearer indication from your authority conservation team as to the suitability of the sites proposed from a heritage perspective. In looking at the information submitted in support of the plan we note that the site assessment and selection process report has been updated to include the comments made by your Design and Conservation Team. This appears to verify the suitability of the Plot adjacent to The Rectory, Pulham Road (Site C) and the site to the rear of The Plot (presumably site B) but the site between Roseacre and Newhaven, Fosters Hill (Site G) and Westbourne (Site H) are not included in the Officers feedback. We are happy to reaffirm our deferral to your authorities Design and Conservation Team in its determination of the suitability of the sites as proposed but would recommend that this gap in the evidence base supporting the policies H1 and H3 be filled.
9	Richard Dodson County Council	In our view opportunities are missed by not including the type of information indicated within NPs. If the recommendations in the guidance attached is followed the NP will be invaluable for helping secure sustainable drainage and reductions in flood risk within the community consequential to subsequent planning applications. We have no other comments on the plan as drafted.