

# Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation Statement

The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations require that, when a Neighbourhood Plan is submitted for examination, a consultation statement should also be submitted setting out the details of those consulted, how they were consulted, the main issues and concerns that people raised, and how these concerns and issues have been considered and where relevant addressed in the proposed plan.

This report therefore provides this overview of the consultation process and how the information gathered influenced the decisions that led to the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan. It covers the period from April 2015 to March 2018, and reports on the main consultations that have been held with local residents and statutory consultees on the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan:

- Household Questionnaire – April 2015
- Options Consultation with Residents and Statutory Consultees - September 2016
- Additional Consultation with Residents – June / July 2017
- Pre- Submission Consultation with Residents and Statutory Consultees – November / December 2017

## 1. Household Questionnaire - 2015

Consultation with local residents commenced in April 2015 with a survey of all households, following a very successful Community Engagement Meeting that had been held in the Village Hall on 25th October 2014 during which Mr John Paul, Shillingstone Neighbourhood Planning Group, outlined their experience, and volunteers stepped forward to join the Neighbourhood Plan Group.

The questionnaires were distributed one to every household in the Parish, and were announced in the Spring 2015 of the Pimperne Village News. They were also made available on the website ([www.pimperne.org.uk](http://www.pimperne.org.uk)) as a printable PDF, or further copies could be requested from the Parish Clerk if additional members of a household wished to complete the survey separately (although the majority of responses were received on behalf of households rather than individuals). Just over 120 responses were received.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections, equating to the relevant Neighbourhood Plan sub groups:

- Housing
- Business and Local Economy
- Infrastructure
- Landscape and Natural/Historic Environment

The main results are shown below:

## 1.1 Housing Section

**Q.1 Please tick the type of housing that is required in Pimperne.**

**Q.2 Over the past 10 years about 50 homes have been built in the Parish. What level of development would you like to see in future?**

Result (expressed as a % of choices made)	Open Market	Social / Affordable	Result (expressed as a % of returns received)	%
Small Home	17.3	15.8	a) we should have much less growth in the future	52.0
Family Home	19.1	9.7	b) this level of housing growth has been OK and should continue	41.5
Space for home working	8.6	2.5	c) we should have more homes built than in previous years	6.5
Adaptable home	11.2	12.6		
Other	3.2	0.0		

Q.3 If you would like to see any further development, where should this be located?		Comments
	%	
Area 1 - Next to Manor Farm Close / opposite St Peter's Close	6.0	<p><u>Against further development:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The character of the village is being lost due to increased size and modern housing. The growth of the past 10 years is more than sufficient.</li> <li>There is increasing pressure on local infrastructure and it is not keeping pace with housing development (eg. Lack of local transport, lack of local employment, inadequate roads, parking and gardens)</li> <li>There is unwanted and increased pressure on greenfield space and local environment (including the stream).</li> <li>Pimperne has had more than its fair share of development compared to other villages nearby.</li> <li>Pimperne is in danger of losing its unique identity and becoming an adjunct of Blandford.</li> <li>There is inadequate suitable building space within the village to sustain the current rate of growth.</li> </ul>
Area 2 - Field behind Berkeley Rise	3.7	
Area 3 - Blandford side of Cricket Pitch	0.7	
Area 4 - Next to Franwill Industrial Estate	3.0	
Area 5 - Behind Old Bakery Close	3.0	
Area 6 - Old school site	1.5	
Area 7 - Same side and to the east of Hyde Farm	2.2	
Area 8 - Same side and to the east of the Farquharson Arms	1.5	
Area 9 - Yarde Farm	0.7	
Area 10 - Other	1.5	
No selection made	76.1	

<p><u>For maintaining the current rate of growth:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More affordable housing is needed to enable both the elderly and young to live in Pimperne.</li> <li>• There is a need to play a part in meeting demand for housing and this rate is not unreasonable.</li> <li>• Yes this rate is acceptable but only with commensurate improvements to local infrastructure (possibly including a village by-pass).</li> <li>• The rate of growth is fine as it is.</li> <li>• This rate of growth is fine provided it is keeping with or enhancing the character of the village.</li> <li>• Sustained growth will keep the village alive.</li> </ul>	<p><u>For increasing the rate of growth:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current rate of growth is inadequate to attract people to the village, including young people.</li> <li>• More development is needed to help alleviate the housing shortage.</li> <li>• Local facilities such as the shop, pubs and Post Office need more people to keep them viable.</li> </ul>
--	--

## 1.2 Business and Local Economy Section

**Q.1 Would you be in favour of allocating land for the creation of a small business centre providing low-cost, flexible workspaces, meeting rooms and managed services for local start-ups, small enterprises, freelancers and home workers?**

Result (expressed as a % of choices made)	%	
Yes	47.9	The main reasons given by those in favour were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) To meet local employment needs</li> <li>b) To increase the village's overall viability</li> <li>c) To extend the existing sites</li> </ul> The main reasons given by those not in favour were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) There was already enough land allocated for business</li> <li>b) Existing sites had unused space</li> <li>c) Roads were unsuitable</li> </ul>
No	47.1	
Other	5.0	
Total	100.0	

The second question concerned renewable energy. Opinion was sought on solar, wind, biomass and ground source energy production

## Q.2 Would you support renewable energy schemes within the Parish?

Result (expressed as a % of choices made)	Yes	No	Other	Total	Comments
Solar	24.4	44.7	30.9	100.0	The majority of respondents were not in favour of any large-scale developments in any of the four areas, although this was less marked for solar and ground source.  For small-scale developments, a large majority favoured solar and ground source with a small majority supporting biomass. Wind power production was not a favoured option.
Wind	9.8	55.3	35.0	100.0	
Biomass	12.2	47.2	40.7	100.0	
Ground source	22.0	33.3	44.7	100.0	

## 1.3 Infrastructure Section

The infrastructure section focused on three main areas: the current use of future facilities and required improvements, traffic, and IT and media services

### Q.1 How often do you use the following facilities?

Result (expressed as a % of choices made)	Often	Occasionally	Never	Total	Comments
Church/Ryland Room	14.9	48.8	36.3	100.0	The usage survey confirmed the importance of the village shop with 80% of respondent claiming to use it often, well ahead of local footpaths/cycle lanes (68%), and the village hall with 34%. At the other end of the scale the lowest usage was recorded for the pre-school facilities, the mobile library and the gym. Perhaps surprisingly 42% of respondents claim to be occasional users of the local bus services.
Village Shop/PO	81.6	18.4	0	100.0	
The Anvil	5.6	60.2	34.3	100.0	
The Farquharson Pub	14.5	66.7	18.5	100.0	
Pre-School/Nurseries	5.3	0.9	93.8	100.0	
Village Hall	34.9	56.1	8.9	100.0	
Play areas	16.0	31.2	52.8	100.0	
Priory Sports Field	2.6	28.2	69.2	100.0	
Local footpaths/cycle lanes	68.1	24.4	7.6	100.0	
Mobile Library	9.2	19.3	71.4	100.0	
Franwill Industrial Estate	6.1	53.5	40.3	100.0	
The Gym	7.5	10.0	82.5	100.0	
Bus Services	9.1	42.1	48.8	100.0	

A wide variety of suggestions were put forward for improvements to existing facilities or new facilities:

- 16% of opinions expressed were about the village shop and post office, with suggestions including the introduction of a wider range of local produce, a café service and Sunday opening (NB the first two of these have already been taken up by the shop)
- Sporting issues accounted for 14% of the comments – ideas including the introduction of tennis courts, outdoor gym facilities.
- Upkeep and maintenance issues accounted for 13% of commentators, with the issue of “dog poo” exercising most and requirements for improvements to stream clearing and grass verges also mentioned by many.
- Leisure improvements were also mentioned by 13% of those respondents who expressed an opinion, with requests for film nights in the village hall popular.
- The recent closure of the Anvil pub has disappointed many and there was a general desire for it to re-open quickly and flourish.
- Public transport issues were mentioned by 8% of comments made. In addition to the general desire for improved services inconvenience was expressed over the recent time change for the market day bus.
- Issues with play areas were accounted for 10% of all comments made, with the main requirement being improved equipment for younger users
- Other areas of interest included the Franwill Industrial Estate (3 comments), improved cycling (2 comments) and another 9 individual comments.

### Q.2 Does the level of traffic in the neighbourhood area affect your quality of life?

Result (expressed as a % of choices made)	No.	%	
Yes	42	34.1	Two thirds of respondents said that traffic was not an issue affecting their quality of life. Of the third who said it did affect their quality of life the main issues are speeding on the A354 and within the village, and traffic noise. Parking in the vicinity of the old school was stated as a problem; this should now be negated by the school's move to its new site. The annual Steam Fair traffic volume and its impact were also mentioned as a problems.
No	80	65.0	
Don't know	1	0.8	
Total	123	100.0	

### Q.3 How do you think matters could be improved?

	Number of responses	
Traffic Calming	33	In terms of solving traffic issues, tackling speeding, the institution of a 20mph zone and traffic calming are interconnected and were the most frequently mentioned suggestions. There is a desire to reduce traffic speed on the A354 and within the village to the legal maximum of 30mph and a possible reduction to 20 mph within the village away from the A354. A pedestrian crossing was suggested on the A354 in the vicinity of the Farquharson Arms. Two respondents specifically suggested the continuation of the 40mph zone from Letton on the A354 to the beginning of the existing 30mph zone in the village as a traffic calming measure.
Tackle Speeding	67	
Crossing	19	
Improved Signage	23	
20mph zone	68	
Other	16	

#### Q.4 How happy are you with the current level of service provided for IT and media?

Result (expressed as a % of choices made)	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Don't Use	No response	Total	
Broadband	19	38	36	5	2	100	Summary of Comments: Broadband – Access to fibre optics (2) Mobile – Talk Talk, EE, O2 poor (3); Vodaphone good (2) TV – Sky good (3); terrestrial poor (1) Radio – DAB/VHF poor (2)
Mobile	20	36	39	1	4	100	
Television	37	36	23	2	2	100	
Radio	28	39	28	3	2	100	
<p>Just over half of respondents said that broadband and mobile telephone services were good or satisfactory. However, this leaves more than a third of respondents reporting poor service. Just under three quarters of respondents reported good or satisfactory TV reception; for some this was as a result of subscription to satellite services rather than reliance on terrestrial transmission. This leaves just under one quarter of respondents reporting poor TV reception. Radio reception was reported as good or satisfactory by two thirds of respondents, leaving just one under one quarter reporting poor reception.</p>							

#### 1.4 Landscape and Natural/Historic Environment Section

##### Q.1 Please list any village 'landmarks' (which can be places or buildings) which you think define the character and identity of the Parish

Landmark	%	Landmark	%	Landmark	%	Landmark	%
Church	63.4	Willows	10.6	The Old Rectory	7.3	Manor Farm Close	2.4
Anvil	33.3	Village Hall	9.8	Old school	5.7	Thatched buildings	2.4
The Old Rectory	26.0	Old flint buildings	9.8	Sports field	5.7	Church yard	2.4
Pimperne Long Barrow	19.5	Stone cross	8.9	Pimperne Wood	5.7	Old Bakery	2.4
Village shop	17.1	New school	7.3	School field	4.9	Play grounds	2.4
Farquharson Arms	15.4	Manor house	7.3	Walks	4.1	Walls (old)	2.4
Stream	15.4	Church Road	7.3	Cricket pavilion	3.3	Stud Farm	2.4

##### Q.2 Do you have any ideas on the future usage of the old school field one DCC's ownership is relinquished?

	%		%		%		%
Village fete	20.3	Open field	8.1	Shrub Flower beds	4.9	Car boot sales	3.3
Seating area	17.1	Tennis Courts	8.1	Toilets	4.1	Trees planted	2.4
Children's play equipment	13.8	Sporting events	7.3	Allotments	4.1	Dog free	2.4
Village functions	13.0	Family play area	7.3	Outdoor gym	4.1		
Nature reserve	8.9	Picnic Area	5.7	Sports/clubs	3.3		

**Q.3 Can you identify any green spaces that are important to you?**

**Q.4 Are there any areas that would benefit from tree planting?**

	%			%
Not specific	24.4		School Field	21.1
School field	22.0		No more trees	12.2
Field behind church	16.3		Anywhere	11.4
Stud Farm walk	7.3		New school area	9.8
Sports Field	5.7		Down Rd.	2.4
Church yard	4.1		Along Salisbury Rd	2.4
Play areas	4.1		Sports Field	1.6
Pimperne wood	3.3		Portman Rd.	1.6
Field to R.H. side of Manor Close	2.4		Outside church	1.6
N.E. of Franwill Ind. Estate	2.4			
Alongside A 354	2.4			

**1.5 Summary of main issues / conclusions that fed into the plan drafting:**

General support for some housing growth but split between broadly maintaining past growth rates or a lower level of provision than in recent years. A range of housing types supported. Decisions on the level, type and location of development will need to take into account retaining the area's unique character, pressure on local infrastructure, possible benefits to community facilities.

There was a similar 'split' between those in favour of more employment units – aims at small business / start-ups – and those feeling that such development was not needed.

A lack of strong support for renewable energy schemes – suggesting that this is not a priority for the Neighbourhood Plan.

Confirmed the importance of the local community facilities – particularly the village shop, hall, and the two pubs. Although the gym and pre-school were not particularly well supported, this may be reflective of the demographic profile of those responding.

Speeding, rather than volume, of traffic was a main concern, both along the A354 and within the heart of the village.

A number of key local landmarks was noted – most notable the church, the Anvil pub and the Old Rectory. Important green spaces included the school field, and the field behind the church. A number of other sites were also suggested and these should be considered further for local green space designation.

## 2. Options Consultation– September 2016

### 2.1 Introduction

In autumn 2016 the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan group undertook a consultation with residents and statutory consultees to gauge reaction on a number of options, relating primarily to potential development sites but also the vision and objectives and what was in essence a first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. The consultation took the form of a questionnaire delivered to all 450 households in the Neighbourhood Planning area, with respondents given 4 weeks to complete. It was launched on 24<sup>th</sup> September at a public meeting which presented the key findings of both the draft Neighbourhood Plan and accompanying Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The event was publicised in the village newsletter which is published on a six monthly basis, and this was backed up with a poster campaign and information included on the village web site, designed to maintain interest and encourage participation.

A total of 115 completed questionnaires were received, representing a response rate of just over 25%.

The following statutory and other consultees were contacted for their input at this stage:

Consultee	Response received
<b>Local Councils</b>	
– Dorset County Council	08 Dec
– North Dorset District Council	29 Nov (Conservation & Design)
– adjoining Parish Councils	see below
o Blandford Town Council	21 Oct
o Bryanston Parish Council	--
o Durweston Parish Council	--
o Stourpaine Parish Council	--
o Tarrant Gunville Parish Council	--
o Tarrant Hinton Parish Council	--
o Tarrant Monkton & Launceston Group Parish Council	--

Consultee	Response received
<b>SEA consultees</b>	
– Environment Agency	05 Dec – no issues raised
– Historic England	25 Oct
– Natural England	27 Oct
<b>Other bodies</b>	
o Cranborne Chase AONB team	24 Oct
o Dorset AONB team	01 Dec – no issues raised
o Wessex Water	18 Oct
o Southern Gas Network	--

The following summarises the key points raised. A more detailed breakdown of the residents' responses is given in **Appendix 1**

Issue	Main points raised	Respondent	Actions
General	The plan could usefully be supported by a Dorset Environmental Records Centre (DERC) data search of the plan area.	Natural England	This data has been acquired



Issue	Main points raised	Respondent	Actions
<b>General</b>	You may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development.	Natural England	Reference made in policies to use of native species in landscaping schemes, retention of hedgerows and biodiversity mitigation plans
<b>General</b>	The introduction could state explicitly that the plan does need to be in conformity with the adopted Local Plan, and to emphasise the national importance of the AONB designation.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	As drafted the plan explains “A Neighbourhood Plan can’t completely change the Local Plan strategy” and “The village stands in a valley (formed by a tributary of the River Stour) within the chalk downlands of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.” Reference to be made in introduction to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty being nationally designated in recognition of their national importance, the primary purpose being to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the landscape, and also incorporated into an objective of the plan.
<b>General</b>	The base map for the sites is not as up-to-date as all of the other plans	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Noted – this was unintentional (the different map was used due to the contours shown) and can be changed for the next draft
<b>Vision and Objectives</b>	There was general consensus that the vision and objectives of the plan were correct with 87% of respondents agreeing. The most frequent comments among dissenters related to traffic speeds, particularly on entering the village and questions over the extent of housing development required	Residents	No change required
<b>Vision and Objectives</b>	The first objective could more strongly reflect that virtually the whole of the area is nationally recognised and designated for its landscape. The third objective could clarify whether the Neighbourhood Plan ‘identifies’ or ‘allocates’ sites. It may be worthwhile considering additional objectives for the wider area, including the Nutford and Letton Park areas as well as the open downlands and woodland	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Agree to add new objective: Protect the wider countryside, including Nutford, Letton Park and other isolated settlements as well as the open downlands and woodland, from inappropriate development that would harm this nationally important landscape
<b>Landscape Character Policy</b>	85% of respondents agreed with the general principles of the Plan, with just 8% disagreeing. A limited number of respondents took issue with the desire to limit development on higher ground areas, claiming that much of the village is already based in higher ground areas.	Residents	No change required

Issue	Main points raised	Respondent	Actions
<b>Landscape Character Policy</b>	Wessex Water have two existing operational assets within the Neighbourhood Plan Area and may need develop these or further assets to ensure the delivery of essential water and sewerage services. While we try and minimise the landscape impact of our works as far as possible, we are sometimes constrained by operational requirements. It is not always possible for us to avoid higher ground and we may be required to provide high fencing to ensure security and provision for lighting in case emergency maintenance is necessary. We are concerned that the proposed Landscape Character Policy may be unduly restrictive	Wessex Water	The policy as worded does not preclude such development, and sets out the key landscape considerations for when development on higher ground cannot be avoided.
<b>Landscape Character Policy</b>	In light of the very high level of protection afforded to AONBs the draft Landscape Character Policy should include an additional initial clause that states all new development within the plan area must not distract from the special qualities of the Cranborne Chase AONB and give the necessary weight to the Cranborne Chase AONB Management Plan policies.	Natural England	Amend policy by addition “All new development within the plan area must not distract from the special qualities of the Cranborne Chase AONB and must have due regard to the Cranborne Chase AONB Management Plan policies”
<b>Landscape Character Policy</b>	The Landscape Character policy could be strengthened further by reference to open and green spaces, along with trees, colour in the landscape and agricultural buildings (see AONB guidance documents).	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Include references to relevant guidance
<b>Landscape Character Policy</b>	The Landscape Character policy could be strengthened further by ‘all woodlands should be protected and managed to sustain them in the long term’.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Agree suggested wording
<b>Landscape Character Policy</b>	The bullet point on the sequence of views could be written more consistent with the other bullet points ie “development that would harm the sequence of views along Church Road will not be permitted”	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Amend wording to read “Development should not harm the views of Pimperne village as appreciated on the approach from the Higher Shaftesbury Road...”
<b>Landscape Character Policy</b>	It may be worth noting that Blandford Camp is the largest single source of light pollution within this AONB. Personal external lighting can be particularly problematic and it may be relevant to refer to the AONB’s documents of this topic.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Include reference to Blandford Camp in introductory paragraphs. Include references to relevant guidance
<b>Landscape Character Policy</b>	It would strengthen the Neighbourhood Plan if the gap was discussed and identified more explicitly. Also the gap between Letton Park and Blandford is not mentioned, and the actual and potential impacts of adjoining development, such as Sunrise Business Park, are not mentioned	CCWWD AONB Partnership	The gap between Blandford Forum and Pimperne Village is to be defined on a map, and further described in the justification.

Issue	Main points raised	Respondent	Actions
<b>Landscape Character Policy</b>	There is no mention or 'use' of the various levels of interrelated Landscape Character Assessments which should be part of the relevant information on which the landscape information is based on and not just that produced for the protected landscape. This should all help to steer the delivery of Objective 1; Character of the village and surroundings	Dorset County Council	Noted the area changes from chalk ridge / escarpment in the east, through wooded chalk downland and, surrounding the village, becomes chalk valley and downland. The landscape descriptions in particular highlight the importance of ancient woodlands and the panoramic views of the surrounding landscape, prehistoric earthworks and the degrading nature of the hard and visually prominent edges to Pimperne, and the plan has been updated to make specific reference to these features.
<b>Local Green Spaces Policy</b>	84% of respondents agreed with the designated green areas identified within the plan. Some respondents queried the retention of the old school field as a green space, believing that it could be utilised for in-fill development to reduce the requirement for development elsewhere and particularly beyond existing boundaries. However, others identified its potential for recreational use, suggesting that its central position should encourage greater participation than the Priory Sports Field. Others questioned the necessity to include the grounds of private houses as protected green spaces.	Residents	In light of Parish Council's lease of the old school field, consider measures to improve recreational use of the old school field. Consider further whether safeguards such as LGS designation are needed to resist inappropriate in-fill opportunities along Church Road if put forward by landowners.
<b>Local Green Spaces Policy</b>	That green, west facing, slope seems quite important in maintaining the rural character of that part of the village. It might be therefore be appropriate to include the green space between Hyde Farm and the Farquharson Arms as a local green space.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	This has not been highlighted as locally valued by residents as a green space – however its importance will be considered from a heritage perspective through the Conservation Area appraisal, and the plan makes clear that the preferred location for housing would be to the west side of the A354 main road, due to the level and speed of traffic along this road, and the need to protect and respect landscape character given the national importance of the Area of Outstanding National Beauty.
<b>Local Green Spaces Policy</b>	It would be more accurate to describe the sports field as being at the southern rather than the western entrance to the village	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Agree suggested wording

Issue	Main points raised	Respondent	Actions
<b>Local Character Policy</b>	81% of respondents agreed with the overall design criteria identified within the plan, and 83% of respondents agreed with the designated important buildings . Some respondents questioned whether the Methodist Chapel and Farquharson Arms buildings were particularly distinctive and worthy of inclusion as protected buildings, while others reported omissions such as Stud House. Others were less convinced over the architectural merit of some of the homes in Church Road, including the old Portman Estate buildings in Down Road.	Residents	Consider adding Stud House into list, and review list further through Conservation Area Appraisal research.
<b>Local Character Policy</b>	The policy might be clearer by putting the second element of the policy first (amended to read ‘the location and design...’) and then identifying a need for long term management of the various features that contribute to local character.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Agree suggested wording
<b>Local Character Policy</b>	The support for gentry houses may be contrary to the need for smaller, more affordable homes later in the plan. The second bullet point ignores the possibility of conversion to live/work units. The fourth bullet point about porches and chimneys being conspicuous may result in these being overly conspicuous.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Although the housing need is not for larger executive homes, it may be that the design of a larger home subdivided into flats would be appropriate. Amend second bullet to read “sympathetically adapted farm buildings” Amend fourth bullet to read “porches and chimneys should be included in keeping with the local character...”
<b>Housing Needs policy</b>	70% of respondents agreed with the housing policy within the plan, compared with less than 20% disagreeing. Some respondents thought there should have been greater emphasis on the use of brownfield sites, while concerns were expressed about the potential build-up of traffic in certain areas, notably Down Road.	Residents	Consider benefits of re-using brownfield sites for in-fill where appropriate
<b>Housing Needs policy</b>	The policy could usefully cross reference to the need for the location of new development to protect and respect open spaces and landscape character. It could also state explicitly that the focus in the provision of housing up to 2031 would be on affordable housing.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Include reference to the need to protect and respect open spaces and landscape character under first bullet point. Add to start of third bullet point: “Affordable housing provision to meet identified local need will be encouraged.”
<b>Employment Needs policy</b>	72% of respondents agreed with the employment policy within the plan, compared with 16% disagreeing. Some respondents remain concerned that development of the Taymix site will diminish the	Residents	No further actions necessary

Issue	Main points raised	Respondent	Actions
	gap between the village and Blandford. Others considered employment off the A354 could help limit business traffic through the village centre. Others questioned the need to provide for more employment.		
<b>Employment Needs policy</b>	There may be difficulty interpreting terms such as ‘substantial’ lorry movements. The third bullet point may clearer referencing the ‘character and the tranquillity of the area’. Reference to benefits in the supporting text could be strengthened by using the term ‘real benefits’.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Delete ‘substantial’ and insert ‘that would adversely impact on local amenity’ Agree other suggested wording changes
<b>Community facilities needs policy</b>	77% of respondents agreed with the community facilities policy within the plan, compared just 7% against. Concern was expressed about the lack of youth facilities, coupled with the poor transport links. Under-utilisation of the sports pavilion and Priory Sports field was also mentioned as a concern.	Residents	Consider provision of adult recreational facilities at the old school field
<b>Community facilities needs policy</b>	Strongly supports the retention of community facilities identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. Consider whether the first sentence could mean that a proposal that has a number of shortcomings still has to be supported. ‘Facilitate’ may be a more positive and encouraging word than ‘allow’. The reference to any unnecessary loss implies that there can be necessary losses without any further clarification.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Support noted. Agree change to ‘Facilitate’ Insert ‘in a manner in keeping with the character of the area’ before ‘will be supported’ Delete “unnecessary”
<b>Traffic and road safety project</b>	Concerned that traffic calming schemes more often than not lead to the urbanisation of rural areas. Some words seem to be missing from the second element, there seems to be no explanation of what the low maintenance would relate to.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Noted – this can be considered by the Parish Council in their engagement with the Highways Authority.
<b>Site allocations (general)</b>	The results show a preference for smaller developments amongst respondents across all three sites.	Residents	Subject to other checks and consideration of mitigation measures to counter concerns raised by local residents, consider allocating land for up to 15 dwellings on all three sites.
<b>Site allocations (general)</b>	Groundwater flooding is identified as an environmental issue in the SEA but this is not reflected in the site allocation assessment basis. Wessex Water are seeking to agree a groundwater management strategy with Dorset County Council as the Local Lead Flood Authority	Wessex Water	Noted – the NP group have consulted with Dorset County Council as the Local Lead Flood Authority. Para inserted into plan to specifically note the flood risks and groundwater management strategy being produced

Issue	Main points raised	Respondent	Actions
<b>Site allocations (general)</b>	In light of the very high level of protection afforded to AONBs the proposed allocations should be subject to an appropriate landscape assessment that has been completed in full consultation with the Cranborne Chase AONB Team	Natural England	The AONB teams have been involved in commenting on the sites to ensure that no site is allocated which would be considered harmful to the AONB.
<b>Site allocations (general)</b>	In order to meet the requirements of the NPPF regarding protection and enhancement of biodiversity interest, the green field sites proposed for development should be supported by a phase 1 ecological survey (extended to Phase 2 in cases where significant interests are found). Sites with significant wildlife interests (in particular any areas of unimproved or species rich semi improved grasslands) should not be developed.	Natural England	Greenfield sites proposed will be subject to an ecology survey prior to submission.
<b>Site allocations (general)</b>	In order to meet the requirements of the NPPF regarding protection and enhancement of biodiversity interest, the Plan should include a policy requiring all new development proposals on greenfield sites greater than 0.1 ha to be supported by a Biodiversity Mitigation Plan (BMP), that has been approved by the Dorset County Council Natural Environment Team (NET).	Natural England	Agreed - the Dorset Biodiversity Protocol is not currently mentioned in either the Local Plan or planning application validation checklist, so could usefully be mentioned in the NP under site requirements.
<b>Site allocations (general)</b>	It is important to avoid site allocations which subsequently reveal significant heritage issues - the evidence – happy if North Dorset District Council are involved in the site evaluation process and its confirmation of a “clean bill of health” as to their suitability from a heritage perspective.	Historic England	Noted – the NP group have consulted with NDDC Conservation and Design.
<b>Land E of Franwill Industrial Estate</b>	49% of respondents agreed with the issues identified in the plan, compared just 7% against. Positive aspects of the proposed development area included the potential for a safe, walking path to the school. By far the greatest concern was over the potential increase in traffic on Down Road and Arlecks Lane, notably owing to the narrow roads.	Residents	Subject to other checks and consideration of mitigation measures to counter concerns raised by local residents, consider allocating land for up to 15 dwellings.
<b>Land E of Franwill Industrial Estate</b>	Preliminary heritage assessment: there is potential for development within this raised site, however mitigation would be required to safeguard the setting of the landmark designated heritage assets (Grade II* listed church, Grade II Manor House) as well as the setting of the Conservation Area.	NDDC Conservation and Design	The smaller site area is selected for taking forward for up to 15 dwellings, alongside specific requirements for landscaping, scale / design

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Main points raised</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>Land E of Franwill Industrial Estate</b>	Whilst there may be scope on the smaller part of the land adjoining Franwill Industrial Estate there seem to be sound landscape reasons for restricting that to the smaller area	CCWWD AONB Partnership	
<b>Land N of Manor Farm Close</b>	62% of respondents agreed with the issues identified in the plan, compared 27% against. Key issues were concerned over the possible build-up of traffic in Church Road, with road widening considered to be a key requirement, increased flood risk, and impact on the character of the approach to the village from the North.	Residents	Subject to other checks and consideration of mitigation measures to counter concerns raised by local residents, consider allocating land for up to 15 dwellings.
<b>Land N of Manor Farm Close</b>	Preliminary heritage assessment: the prominent and open character of this site has potential to cause considerable harm to the adjoining Conservation Area. Exceptional mitigation through design, form and layout would be required and a limited development of under 25 would better respect the significance of the setting and enable more successful mitigation to be achieved	NDDC Conservation and Design	The smaller site area is selected for taking forward for up to 15 dwellings, alongside specific requirements for landscaping, scale / design
<b>Land N of Manor Farm Close</b>	The site is one of the remaining flat areas in the village therefore could be needed for sports purposes. A single storey development could be achieved on the higher, western parts of the site provided landscape works could integrate buildings there	CCWWD AONB Partnership	
<b>Land at the top of Berkeley</b>	73% of respondents agreed with the issues identified in the plan, compared 15% against. The main concerns related to traffic issues, particularly during construction, and that any development in this area would reduce the “gap” with Blandford.	Residents	Subject to other checks and consideration of mitigation measures to counter concerns raised by local residents, consider allocating land for up to 15 dwellings.
<b>Land at the top of Berkeley</b>	Preliminary heritage assessment: the prominent and open character of this site has potential to cause harm to a designated heritage asset and suspected archaeology. In the case of the former, mitigation will allow some development to take place, however, dependant on the outcome of discussions with DCC, archaeology may be a hindrance or require mitigation	NDDC Conservation and Design	Following further discussion with the AONB advisor and the landowners, and alternative adjoining site west of Old Bakery Close has been subject to consultation and included in lieu of the Berkeley Rise site, for taking forward for up to 15 dwellings, alongside specific requirements for landscaping, scale / design
<b>Land at the top of Berkeley</b>	The site at the top of Berkeley Rise seems to be the most problematic and least feasible because of the elevated nature of the site and access issues.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	
<b>Extension south of Taymix</b>	60% of respondents were in favour of a small extension to the Taymix site, compared with 28% against. The main concern was that the gap between Pimperne and Blandford should be maintained wherever possible.	Residents	See below

Issue	Main points raised	Respondent	Actions
<b>Extension south of Taymix</b>	Preliminary heritage assessment: this site has potential to cause harm to a designated heritage asset and its setting. Provided mitigation is employed there would be no demonstrable harm.	NDDC Conservation and Design	The likely impact on the AONB and the gap separating the village from Blandford Forum is a key concern. Alternative opportunities, including the expansion of the Yarde Farm employment area to the north / east from the existing access, and the re-use of the former agricultural buildings on Hyde Farm, were also proposed and an initial review would suggest these would have less adverse impacts.
<b>Extension south of Taymix</b>	The current Taymix site stands out from a number of locations and an extension would exacerbate that situation and narrow the gap between Pimperne and the Letton Park Blandford area. The AONB cannot support the extension of the Taymix site as currently proposed. Lower ground to the east of Yarde Farm, opposite the entrance to the Pyke site, could be investigated as a possible employment site	CCWWD AONB Partnership	On this basis there is no apparent local need to allocate an employment site, and more general policy approach has been included in the plan, generally supporting the approach taken in the Local Plan, but highlighting the need to consider the landscape and traffic impacts of such development.
<b>Discarded options</b>	61% of respondents agreed with the issues identified in the plan, compared 29% against. The main suggestion was that housing development of the Hyde Farm re-using the existing buildings could be considered further to assist in obtaining a safe crossing over the A354.	Residents	Continue to consider housing development in the Hyde Farm area over the A354 as a potential alternative option
<b>Discarded options</b>	Agrees with the assessment of the land to the rear of the Farquharson Arms and the other discarded options.	CCWWD AONB Partnership	Support noted
<b>Other issues</b>	The Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for a scheme up to Pimperne's boundary and for that scheme to deliver the full range of infrastructure necessary to support Blandford Forum, and surrounding parishes, including Pimperne, it may be necessary for a small element of development in Pimperne, as shown on the masterplan in the Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan evidence base, primarily green infrastructure to mitigate the effects on the adjoining AONB and to preserve the gap between the town and the village, a goal with which Blandford Forum Town Council wholeheartedly agrees. It would therefore be useful to the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan to make reference to such infrastructure delivery.	Blandford Forum Town Council	The draft Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan examiner's report has recommended the deletion of the scheme abutting Pimperne.



### 3. Additional Consultation with Local Residents – June / July 2017

The purpose of this consultation was to confirm whether that the Neighbourhood Planning Group had correctly reflected local mood in its proposal on three prime sites for development within and/or adjoining to the settlement boundary. The opportunity was also taken to gauge public reaction on the importance of retention of the gap between Blandford and the village, and a proposal to re-draw the settlement boundary in the area around the Farquharson Arms public house.

The consultation took the form of a presentation and question and answer session. The decision was taken to hold two events in the Village Hall. The first was scheduled to take advantage of the regular coffee morning, which is attended by upwards of 60 people, and to avoid focusing too much on a particular demographic, a separate drop-in event was held later to maximise attendance. Attendees were invited to complete a brief questionnaire, covering three main questions.

Both consultation events were advertised by means of posters directed at local residents and strategically situated around the village. The posters were displayed in week commencing 15th May. The consultation period closed on 9th July.

A total of 38 responses were received. Detailed comments received are shown in **Appendix 2**.

#### Do you support the three development sites proposed?

Count	38	Agreed	Disagree	Don't Know
Franwill		33	4	1
Manor Farm Close		26	11	1
Old Bakery Close		31	6	1

#### Do you agree with the “important gaps” identified?

		Agreed	Disagree	Don't Know
Count	38	29	7	2

#### Do you agree with the re-drawing of the settlement boundary?

		Agreed	Disagree	Don't Know
Count	38	24	9	5

There was strong support for the three selected sites. More than 80% of respondents were in favour of the Franwill Industrial Estate site and the area off Old Bakery Close while more than two in three local residents who replied supported the Manor Farm Close site. There was also general local support expressed in relation to the gaps and settlement boundary changes.

## 4. Consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan

The pre submission draft consultation was advertised via a leaflet drop made to all households within the Neighbourhood Planning area with an invitation to attend a drop in event at the Village hall on 25th November. The documentation was also made available on the Parish Council website throughout the consultation period, which ran for six weeks from 10th November to 22nd December 2017. A public drop-in session took place on Saturday 25th November 2017 at the Village Hall. Members of the Neighbourhood Planning Group were available to answer any questions and there was an opportunity to make comment. Paper copies of the draft pre-submission plan were available. A total of 65 residents attended the drop-in event. Concurrently the following statutory consultees were contacted directly by letter and/or email with a copies of the pre-submission documents with requests made for comment:

Consultee	Responded
<b>Local Councils</b>	
– Dorset County Council	✓ (1)
– North Dorset District Council	✓ (2)
– Blandford Town Council	✓ (3)
– Bryanston Parish Council	
– Durweston Parish Council	
– Stourpaine Parish Council	
– Tarrant Gunville Parish Council	
– Tarrant Hinton Parish Council	
– Tarrant Monkton & Launceston Group Parish Council	

Consultee	Responded
<b>SEA consultees</b>	
– Environment Agency	✓
– Historic England	✓
– Natural England	
<b>Other bodies</b>	
○ Cranborne Chase AONB team	✓
○ Dorset AONB team	✓
○ Wessex Water	✓
○ Southern Gas Network	✓

- (1) late response received confirming no substantive comments  
 (2) Planning Policy plus late response from Conservation and Design Officer  
 (3) Blandford Town Council responded with the support of Blandford +

Responses were also received from the following landowners and local residents:

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| – Davies Coats families (Cliff Lane, Director, Savills)                        | – Andrew and Barbara Hunt |
| – Hall and Woodhouse Ltd (Lynne Evans, Consultant, Southern Planning Practice) | – Miss J Fletcher         |
| – P and D Crocker (Steve Clark, Associate, Savills)                            | – David Latham            |
| – Taymix (Cliff Lane, Director, Savills)                                       | – Margaret Latham         |
| – Wyatt Homes (Tim Hoskinson, Planning Manager)                                | – Martin Draycott         |
|  | – Mr and Mrs D Philpott   |

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
General	I do not consider the plan presents any significant issues affecting Dorset AONB	Dorset AONB Partnership	Support noted	No further action required
General	The plan accords with the principles set out in the National and Local Planning Policies, including flood risk Sequential test, and have no objection to the plan	Environment Agency	Support noted	No further action required
General	Support the plan as drafted	Miss J Fletcher, Martin Draycott	Support noted	No further action required
Various policies	There are a number of phrasing issues in the wording of policies (LC, MHN, MEN and HSAs) which reduces their clarity. It may be beneficial to break down some elements into separate points and to ensure that the geographical scope of policies is properly established. A number of elements also serve to repeat local or national policies.	North Dorset District Council	Policy LC can be modified to clarify where different elements are intended to apply. This is particularly relevant to development on higher ground that is within the settlement boundary. The first bullet in Policy MHN would also benefit from being reconfigured to avoid confusion, particularly in regard to focusing housing growth to the west side of the A354 main road on land within or adjacent to the settlement boundary. Policy MEN would benefit from clearer demarcation of the tests. Although there is some overlap with national / local policy requirements in HAS (eg avoiding flood risk) this is considered appropriate given the site-specific nature of the policies.	Minor amendments suggested to Policies LC, MHN and MEN to improve clarity
Page 01 Para 7	Blandford + have secured approval from the Councils to pursue the following options in parallel: - Withdraw and modify the existing Neighbourhood Plan; - Responding to NDDC's Issues and Options Consultation Paper; and - Close liaison with prospective developers for the sites promoted in Policy 1 of the current draft of the Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan to attempt to ensure that any planning application shares the aspirations of	Blandford Town Council	Noted – the paragraph can be updated to reflect the current situation	Modify the paragraph to reflect the group's intention to withdraw and modify the Plan

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
	Blandford +, and its three communities, as far as possible.			
Page 01 Para 3	The document mentions that there is a good level of employment land within and just beyond the parish. The Issues and Options Consultation paper recently published by North Dorset District Council infers that employment land is necessary.	Blandford Town Council, Taymix	The statement is true (within Pimperne there is some 3.6ha of employment land, adjoining the parish is Sunrise Business Park which is 5.5ha, and on the northern side of the town there is also Blandford Heights Industrial Estate, Holland Business Park and Glenmore Business Park providing a further 22ha of employment land). However the key point to be made is that no suitable sites were identified and the need for further employment land of a strategic nature is being investigated through the Local Plan review.	Amend paragraph to delete reference to existing employment land, and include reference to the Local Plan Review's consideration of additional strategic employment sites at Blandford
Page 02 Para 6	At this point CIL has not been adopted and any necessary planning obligations continue to be secured by Section 106 agreements	North Dorset District Council	Notes – this can be clarified. Given the ongoing uncertainty it would be prudent to include an additional project identifying the social infrastructure requirements identified through the NP to which developer contributions may be sought under Local Plan policy 14.	Add caveat to para 06 re: if the Community Infrastructure Levy is introduced. Add new section 'Community Infrastructure Levy and Developer Contributions' and associated policy on seeking developer contributions where appropriate for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the provision of new allotments,</li> <li>– improved pre-school premises,</li> <li>– improvements to the former school playing field for recreational use,</li> <li>– road safety projects relating to footpaths and cycleways to the school.</li> </ul>
Page 04 Para 1	It is not clear on page 4, paragraph 1, how the distance from Blandford Forum to Pimperne was measured. From the	Blandford Town Council	The measurement is in relation to the built-up areas. The distance between the bypass and the first houses in the village is approximately 0.8 miles.	Make minor amendments to the sentence to improve clarity.

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
	centre of each, the distance measures closer to 3 miles, not 1 mile as stated in the document.			
Page 05 Para 6	Concerned that the proposed timescale for the plan does not cover a sufficient time period covering only 13 years if the plan is made in 2018. The plan should cover a 15-year time horizon. It is suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan takes this opportunity to consider aligning with the plan period of North Dorset's Local Plan Review to at least 2033.	Davies Coats families, P and D Crocker	There is no statutory requirement or national policy guidance on the appropriate time periods for a NP to cover (para 157 applies only to Local Plans). The plan period as set to align to the adopted Local plan is considered appropriate at this early stage in the Local Plan Review.	No further action required
Page 05 Para 2	It would be more accurate for this paragraph to state that the focus for growth should be within or adjoining the settlement boundary of the village.	Wyatt Homes	The wording is intended to align with Policy 20 of the Local Plan, however it could be simplified by using the "at the village".	Replace 'within the settlement boundary of' with 'at'.
Page 06 Para 2	Reference to the light pollution specifically highlights Blandford Forum and Blandford Camp as major sources, and does not reflect that part of Pimperne also contributes to this light pollution. It is also a Blandford + commitment to ensure strategies are in place to minimise light spill into the AONB from proposed developments.	Blandford Town Council	The wording has taken into advice from the AONB Partnership "the latest satellite recording of light pollution indicates that Blandford Camp is the largest single source of light pollution within this AONB". However it is accepted that as written the 'and' implies this includes the town.	Separate Blandford Forum from Blandford Camp, and instead refer to the concentration of lights in Blandford Forum
Page 06 Para 8	The area on the other side of the bypass that separates Blandford bypass from Letton Park, are the town's allotments, which Blandford + considers is part of the town of Blandford Forum.	Blandford Town Council	This paragraph relates to the character of Letton Park (on the opposite side of the road from the allotments) and the undeveloped nature of the land to the south which is in the NP area, and not to the allotments (which are outside the plan area).	No further action required
Page 06 Para 8	The bypass built is an incredibly expensive piece of infrastructure, and not utilising sites around this piece of infrastructure is inefficient.	Blandford Town Council	Disagree - the efficiency of using such sites would depend on the impact of their development on the operation of that piece of infrastructure.	No further action required

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
Page 07 Para 1	There are several parts in the document that indicates that Letton Park is part of Pimperne, but separate from the village. It has not been fully justified why the buildings in Letton Park is part of the gap when it has been recognised that the buildings in Letton Hill is not.	Blandford Town Council	At a density of about 3dph, and a parkland-style character, Letton Park is considered to retain a significantly more undeveloped character than Letton Hill, which has a comparable density of 10dph.	No further action required
Page 08 Policy LC and Page 1 Para 7	Agrees with the conclusion that retaining the clear countryside gap between Pimperne Village and the Town of Blandford Forum is important.	Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership	Support noted	No further action required
Page 08 Policy LC	Suggest policy wording is amended to proposals 'demonstrating' how they have had regard to the AONB Management Plan and its policies, to avoid misinterpretation	Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership	Agreed, and it would also be appropriate to also reference the Dorset AONB (as the smaller settlement of Nutford falls within that landscape designation)	Refer to Nutford being within the Dorset AONB (page 04) and update Policy LC to state that all new development within the plan area must not distract from the special qualities of the Cranborne Chase and Dorset AONBs and must demonstrate that account has been taken of the relevant AONB Management Plan policies
Page 08 Policy LC	The goal to preserve the gap between the town and the village is one which Blandford + wholeheartedly agrees with. The proposed allocation in Policy 1 of the Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan is driven by the need for infrastructure, and it may be necessary for a small element of development in Pimperne, as shown on the masterplan in the Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan evidence base. The policy appears to recognise that there may be some circumstances where development is required.	Blandford Town Council	Support for the preservation of the gap is noted. At the current time the proposed allocation in Policy 1 is suggested for deletion in the Examiner's report, and the strategic growth of Blandford is a matter outside the remit of the Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan. Such a strategic decision would need to take into account, as far as possible, the agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made.	No further action required

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
Page 08 Policy LC	<p>The need for a gap policy under (g) is questioned, when the current extent of the gap is so great. Including the Davis Coats land and the built development of Letton Park is a step too far, bearing in mind it is screened from Pimperne by Letton Park and existing dwellings fronting the A354.</p> <p>Including the built development of Letton Park in a gap policy is an absolute nonsense. If there has to be a gap policy, the southern boundary should be the northern boundary of Letton Park. The character of Letton Park could be maintained by other planning tools, for example allocating the Davies Coats land for housing with appropriate development criteria and planning conditions. If a gap policy is to be considered its northern boundary should not extend as far north as currently proposed taking in Taymix land, as this would frustrate the need for its expansion.</p>	Davies Coats families, Taymix	The extent of the gap is not considered 'great' particularly given the open nature of the landform and experience travelling between the two settlements. The reason for including Letton Park and the land to the south is explained in the final paragraph on Page 6. If the gap is shortened as proposed, it is clear from the submissions that there would be pressure for development in both locations, which in turn would undoubtedly lead to a greater feeling of coalescence between the two settlements contrary to this plans' objectives.	No further action required
Page 08 Para 2	Refers to helpful documents - it is not clear how these documents, which are not listed, are intended to support the policy.	Blandford Town Council	Reference could be made to the AONB website as the source of these documents. It may also be appropriate to list the plan's supporting documents in an Appendix.	Add reference to the AONB website and Appendix 1 – supporting documents
Page 09 Para 6	You may want to consider protecting the grounds of the Old Rectory and adjoining land off Church Road from development in a different way rather than simply relying on its Conservation Area status, as the legislation allows for development that preserves or enhances.	Blandford Town Council	The status of this site as a potential LGS was explored through the options consultation. This area was the most questioned by local residents as to its value to them, given that the area consists entirely of private gardens having no local function. It is therefore considered appropriate that the mechanism for protecting this space is based on different tests as per the relevant designations (Conservation Area,	No further action required

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
			part area TPO and part would also form setting of Listed Buildings).	
Page 15 Policy LDC	The AONB welcomes the references to Guidance Documents within the Neighbourhood Plan and also welcomes Policy LDC; as this is a positive step towards enabling the character and scale of future development to integrate with characteristics of the Parish.	Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership	Support noted	No further action required
Page 15 Policy LDC	The selection of preferred materials should be widened to allow more innovation and site-specific solutions. The existing mix of both street frontage development and smaller groups of buildings set back from the road should be continued to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the village - the emphasis on the majority of new development fronting the street should be reconsidered.	Hall and Woodhouse Ltd	The policy as worded is considered to be sufficiently flexible – ‘should’, ‘majority’, ‘generally’ and ‘in general’ all imply that there can be exceptions with justification	No further action required
Page 16 Policy MHN	Notes that Policy MHN approaches the provision of affordable housing positively and supports the findings of the AONB Management Plan.	Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership	Support noted	No further action required
Page 16 Policy MHN and housing summary	The progress of the Neighbourhood Plan in advance of the new housing evidence due to be considered by NDDC in its Local Plan Review would be premature and could result in a Neighbourhood Plan under examination that is based upon an out of date Local Plan and out of date housing figures, which is not good planning. The number of homes required is a minimum target and is expected to increase and therefore the Neighbourhood Plan should look to	Davies Coats families, P and D Crocker, Wyatt Homes	The main conclusions of the housing research were that, to meet local need in Pimperne, the Neighbourhood Plan should make provision for between 40 to 45 new dwellings between 2016 and 2031. This included consideration of the ‘uplift’ suggested by the 2015 SHMA, but has not taken into account the further uplift implied by the draft DCLG figures (which would uplift the 39 pro-rata rural estimate by 28.4% ([366-285]/285) to 50 dwellings. However this figure has not yet been confirmed of tested through the Local Plan examination. The Neighbourhood Plan identified supply is approx. 56/57	Amend para 4 (below housing summary) by inserting “Although there is no agreed housing target for Pimperne, this range (40 – 45) was considered an appropriate starting point on which to base this plan, whilst recognising that there needs to be some flexibility in deciding the final number and size of



Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
	increase its housing needs in line with projected increases and allocate more sites to ensure that it can meet these needs. Consideration should be given to increasing the Neighbourhood Plan housing target to 50-60 dwellings.		dwellings provides some flexibility given this scenario and the dependency on local landowners to bring the sites forward in line with the plan's policies.	sites chosen." Amend MHN to read "...should meet and potentially exceed this projected need by a small margin, and..."
Page 16 Policy MHN and housing summary	The draft allocations results in the provision for 56-57 houses over the plan period. No justification is provided for the provision of housing above the level of need identified.	North Dorset District Council	See above	See above
Page 16 Policy MHN	The level of housing proposed is not based on demand from the community and does not take into account the strategic proposals for the north of Blandford. Furthermore the Local Plan, at para 5.26, states that the figure is neither a target or cap.	David Latham, Margaret Latham	See above - the housing research considered a number of different factors in reaching its conclusion on the appropriate level of development. The strategic proposals for expansion of Blandford are a matter for the Local Plan Review, and no decisions have yet been taken on the direction of growth.	See above
Page 16 Para 5	The principle of affordable housing exception sites is grounded in national policy in the NPPF as well as local policy. Therefore if it can be demonstrated that there is a local need for affordable housing and this can be delivered on a rural exceptions site the Neighbourhood Plan should not seek to preclude such delivery.	Davies Coats families	The policy does not exclude the possibility of rural exception sites – but it is considered appropriate to highlight in the text that there may be no need for such sites given the development that is planned (and the Local Plan 5.151 makes clear that the justification for the provision of rural exception housing is an evidenced extant local need, which it recognises can fluctuate over time).	No further action required
Page 16 Policy MHN	Development within the village envelope, including infill development, should be prioritised over greenfield land	Hall and Woodhouse Ltd	Sites within the village envelope were assessed through the site allocation process. There is no national or local plan policy basis to prioritise these, although the re-use of land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), is still to be encouraged, and residential gardens are specifically excluded from the definition of previously developed land. Policy	No further action required

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
			MHN includes reference to both infill opportunities and the conversion of existing buildings.	
Page 16 Policy MHN and Page 28 Policy SB	Agrees with the conclusion that focussing the future development of the village on the north western side of the A354 is likely to minimise risks crossing an increasingly busy road whilst facilitating transport in a location where the possibility of a bypass is extremely low.	Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership	Support noted	No further action required
Page 16 Policy MHN and Page 28 Policy SB	Reference to west side of the A354 as proposed location for new houses should be deleted. This will bring additional traffic and congestion to the main village streets, rather than helping to reduce it. By contrast, appropriate development on the east side of the A354 would offer opportunities to improve crossing opportunities of the main road and help to slow traffic down as it passes through Pimperne.	Hall and Woodhouse Ltd	The reasons for the preferred location being to the west side of the A354 are clearly stated. Sites to the east of the A354 were tested through the plan-making process but were not considered to be preferable to those proposed for the reasons set out. The approach taken is supported by the AONB advisor (see above). The potential for development to help control traffic speeds and/or offer opportunities to improve the crossing of the main road was discussed at an early stage with the DCC's Transport Development Liaison Manager, whose opinion expressed at that time was that the likely improvements could be considered in terms of dropped kerbs or similar measures, and that a signalised pedestrian crossing or other physical measures to actively slow traffic were unlikely to be supported given the importance of maintaining traffic flows along this strategic highway route.	No further action required
Page 16 Policy MHN Page 21 Para 6 and Page 28 Policy SB	We object to the Neighbourhood Plan's approach to the preclusion of any housing development to the eastern side of the A354 on page 28. There is already a degree of presence of built form to the east of the A354, which is historic and dates back more than 150 years. Additionally, the A354 runs past Letton Park in the southern part of the	Davies Coats families	The reasons for the preferred location being to the west side of the A354 are clearly stated, and as carried into Policy MHN this relates to sites within or adjacent to the settlement boundary of Pimperne Village and would not therefore apply to other sections of the A354. On page 22 the plan makes clear land unrelated to the village of Pimperne was not assessed for development, as options for the future growth needs of Blandford are a strategic	No further action required

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
	<p>Parish. This reference to no development to the east of the A354 potentially excludes the possibility of the development of my clients' land east of the A354 and immediately to the south of Letton Park. This land is not in the AONB and could make a valuable contribution to meeting the housing needs of Blandford and the District as a whole.</p>		<p>matter for the Local Plan (as agreed by the Blandford + examiner).</p>	
<p>Page 16 Policy MHN and Page 28 Policy SB</p>	<p>We consider that the proposed redrawing of the settlement boundary is inappropriate. The land to the east has been excluded based on potential landscape impact on the AONB and the rural character it affords to the village. The reasons for the revisions are flawed and do not support economic growth in rural areas as required by the NPPF. It removes all properties on the eastern side of the A354 some of which have been there at least 150years and are part of the core of the village. The village has developed along the valley floor and on both sides of the A354 - this is an essential part of the existing character of the settlement. The Farquharson Arms is recognised as a locally important building marking the southern 'entrance' to the historic core along Church Road and considered to be a key community asset in the village which should be retained within the boundary and new development steered by development management policies. Through this Plan they are now being told they are no longer part of the village.</p>	<p>Hall and Woodhouse Ltd, Taymix</p>	<p>One of the plan's objectives is to "Identify suitable sites or areas where new development can take place that will meet anticipated need for housing, employment and community facilities". The settlement boundary is a planning tool that indicates where infill development in principle is acceptable. The exclusion from the settlement boundary does not prohibit all development (such as conversions and small-scale extensions) – but does limit the potential for additional open market housing. Specific site allocations have been included – therefore the revision is not limited the growth identified as appropriate for the village. No affront was intended. Where the settlement boundary is drawn does not define from a social point or any other point of view whether a property or its residents are part of a community. Neither is the fact that a building is historic the correct basis for deciding whether infill development is appropriate.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
Page 17 Employt summary	It is not clear why Sunrise Business Park is not as accessible to most Pimperne residents as there are classified roads into and out of the Business Park that all lead to and from Pimperne.	Blandford Town Council	What was intended to be conveyed was that this site is not as accessible by sustainable modes of transport (walking, cycling, public transport) due to the distance and nature of the road network and bus routes	Amend to "...it is not as accessible on foot to most Pimperne residents or easy to reach by bus"
Page 17 Employt summary	Notes the discussion and conclusions relating to Employment and Employment Needs and, in the circumstances, these seem entirely reasonable.	Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership	Support noted	No further action required
Page 17 Employt summary	The Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan does not recognise, or value, that Pimperne relies heavily on wider employment from Blandford Forum	Blandford Town Council	Agreed that further references to the employment opportunities would be appropriate	Include reference to Blandford Heights Industrial Estate, Holland Business Park and Glenmore Business Park which also provide significant employment opportunities on the northern side of the town.
Page 17 Policy MEN	There is sufficient capacity on the network to support the proposed development sites, however significant development at "EMP (S) – Yarde Lane/Farm" could potentially bring pressures below that of acceptable levels if connected to the low-pressure network without reconfiguration. In order to facilitate growth of the employment site at Yarde Lane, it would be preferable to feed any new properties separately from the MP main.	SGN	Noted. This is a detailed matter that could be addressed at planning application stage, and will depend on the nature of the business in question. It was not an issue that precluded the recent expansion of the Yarde Lane site under 2/2017/0194/FUL, given that this was for vehicle parking and storage areas.	No further action required
Page 17 Policy MEN	The larger expansion of the Taymix to the south would help meet the needs of existing industrialists on the Taymix site and assist in meeting the needs for additional employment land close to Blandford where it has been	Taymix	The expansion of the Taymix was considered through the plan preparation process, but as explained on page 17 this raised objections in terms of its likely impact on the AONB and the larger option would also have significantly reduced the gap separating the village from Blandford Forum. At the Blandford + NP	No further action required

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
	demonstrated there is an outstanding need. At Yarde Farm it is noted that the NDDC Planning Board recently resolved to grant planning permission to expand the KJ Pike site, following the submission of a retrospective planning application, despite AONB and Parish Council objections.		examination the site's representative made clear that the firm was also considering other site options in the area, and therefore may relocate.	
Page 18 Community Facilities summary	Blandford Forum has an Allotment Management Committee who runs two allotment sites in the town. Residents who have shown an interest in Pimperne are welcome to contact the Committee to apply for an allotment while Pimperne investigates securing its own allotment site.	Blandford Town Council	Noted – the Parish Council can make this clear to residents enquiring about allotments until such time as a site is brought forward in the parish.	No changes required to the plan.
Page 18 Community Facilities summary	Blandford Forum also provides doctor surgeries, dentists, community hospital, sport clubs, the leisure centre, shopping and the post office (due to the recent closure of these in Pimperne), petrol and a large array of other products and services. The Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan does not recognise, or value, that Pimperne is an integral part of a larger community, and as such, relies heavily on that wider community for its essential infrastructure.	Blandford Town Council	The summary was not intended to imply that these services did not exist or are not valued.	Amend bullet point to read “The parish is reliant on the nearby town of Blandford Forum for many of its services, such as secondary education, healthcare and library facilities, as well as benefiting from the many products and services found in the town centre”
Page 18 Para 3	You may wish to accurately reflect the current situation of the post office and shop in the village	Blandford Town Council	Agreed this should be updated to reflect its recent closure. This does not change the fact that it is a valued facility and its lawful planning use as a shop remains.	Amend text to reflect the fact that the shop and post offices has recently closed, but retain it in the list of valued facilities.
Page 18 Para 3	No mention is made as to the future of the former shop premises	Mr and Mrs D Philpott	This is referenced in paragraph 3, and its retention as a shop would still considered under Policy CF as this	See above

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
			remains its lawful use until such time as a change of use is permitted.	
Page 19 Policy CF	We agree the policy wording which supports development proposals to enable key community assets to modernise and adapt for future needs. It is important that this objective is interpreted in a flexible and positive manner.	Hall and Woodhouse Ltd	Support noted	No further action required
Page 23 Table of rejected sites	The opportunity for a small housing development on land at The Farquharson Arms should be reconsidered	Hall and Woodhouse Ltd	The site was considered as part of the plan preparation process, and was not preferred. No evidence has been put forward that would suggest that this site would be preferable to those selected. The scheme submitted under 2/2016/1801/FUL (now withdrawn) was not supported by the Conservation Officer who commented that the scheme would be “at the expense of a substantial loss of natural green open space and which constitutes the setting of the various heritage assets.” and that the harm was not be justified. The AONB officer also commented that the scheme would encroach significantly on the currently undeveloped side of the valley, and that the extension of gardens up the slope of the valley would have a further urbanising impact on what is currently a rural scene.	No further action required
Page 23 Table of rejected sites	Land to the south and east of Hyde Farm, Pimperne should be reconsidered. The character of Pimperne has included the eastern side of the A354, and a quantum of development here could reinforce the local character of Pimperne without causing harm to the AONB landscape. Highway concerns are not severe and there is scope to consider the provision of a pedestrian crossing over the A354 as part of any proposal to address any significant highway impact.	P and D Crocker	The site was considered as part of the plan preparation process, and was not preferred. No evidence has been put forward that would suggest that this site would be preferable to those selected.	No further action required

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
Page 23 Para 1	Land north of Manor Farm Close is available now and Wyatt Homes are keen to deliver this site at an early stage in the plan period	Wyatt Homes	Noted	No changes required to the plan.
Page 24 PolicyHSA 1	It is unclear in (f) what improvements would be required for safe pedestrian access, and viability / feasibility implications.	North Dorset District Council	The current advice as provided by the highways authority is reflected in the table above under 'access points / and suitability'. This can be examined further at planning application stage, and therefore has not been detailed in the policy.	No further action required
Page 24 PolicyHSA 1	If the suitability of housing on this site is dependent upon cross-subsidy of employment enhancements in (h) this would need to be justified.	North Dorset District Council	The policy wording is that the upgrades would be supported, and was proposed by the landowner, but has not been written as a requirement as the details of the upgrades and reasonableness has not been evidenced	No further action required
Page 24 Policy HSA1	The earlier NDDC Conservation Team advice appears to conclude that development in principle is acceptable but that evidence will be needed to support the location, numbers and design of any proposals and policy criteria adopted	Historic England	NDDC Conservation Team contacted to check whether any concerns remain regarding this site. No issues raised.	No further action required
Page 24 PolicyHSA 1 and Page 26 PolicyHSA 2	Should construction traffic be restricted to entering the village from the west end of Church Road via Shaftesbury top road for safety reasons?	Martin Draycott	The Plan does not preclude a Construction Traffic Management Plan being required by condition if advised by the Highways Authority. This would identify the appropriate route/s for HGV traffic to access the site during the construction phase and establish measures to reduce any interruption and/or delay to existing vehicular traffic to ensure that the impacts of construction traffic in the vicinity of the site and on the surrounding highway network are kept to a minimum.	No further action required
Page 24-27 Policies HSA1-3	Coupled with Policy LDC, the view of the AONB is that the sensitive development of these sites should be achievable without undue harm to the AONB at this location	Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership	Noted	No changes required to the plan.

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
Page 24-27 Policies HSA1-3	We note the plan and locations for 40 – 45 new dwellings. None of the sites appear to affect existing apparatus, there is capacity available from local networks to provide water supply and waste water services for the planned growth.	Wessex Water	Noted – this can be included in the infrastructure section	Add reference to end of infrastructure section (pg 20)
Page 24-27 Policies HSA1-3	Please note that no surface water connections will be permitted to the foul sewer. It is paramount that sites are promoted with a satisfactory means of disposal for surface water to infiltration or local land drainage systems	Wessex Water	Noted – this can be mentioned in the infrastructure section	Add reference to end of infrastructure section (pg 20)
Page 26 PolicyHSA 2	It is unclear in (e) what improvements would be required for safe pedestrian access, and viability / feasibility implications.	North Dorset District Council	The current advice as provided by the highways authority is reflected in the table above under 'access points / and suitability'. This can be examined further at planning application stage, and therefore has not been detailed in the policy.	No further action required
Page 26 PolicyHSA 2	The earlier NDDC Conservation Team advice appears to conclude that development in principle is acceptable but that evidence to substantiate specific development proposals would be necessary and policy criteria adopted	Historic England	NDDC Conservation Team contacted to check whether any concerns remain regarding this site. Response confirmed that Policy HSA2 appears to be acceptable, making reference to the rural setting which is presently characterised by the native hedgelines and the acknowledgement that the development needs to respect the Conservation Area character and recognise that the site is situated at a key gateway into the settlement.	No further action required
Page 26 PolicyHSA 2	Support the proposed allocation in Policy HSA2. Consideration should be given to extending the proposed housing site allocation to the west, to a number of benefits including scope for larger rear gardens and an area of public open space and tree planting along the western edge of the site, potentially connecting to the green space to the	Wyatt Homes	Support noted. A larger area was considered extending further west as one of the options, but was discarded due to the greater landscape and heritage impacts, particularly related to building works. The provision of public open space on the higher ground would not be precluded by the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to an appropriate assessment of any harm, and should the landowner wish to make this land	No further action required



Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
	rear of St Peter's Church and the footpath network beyond. It would also allow greater flexibility for the layout to accommodate surface water attenuation as part of any sustainable drainage system.		available as an area of public open space, then this can be explored with the Parish Council.	
Page 26 PolicyHSA 2	Measures to not increase flood risk are important and need to be explicitly stated in the policy	Andrew and Barbara Hunt	The issue is covered in policy by the inclusion of "The development should be designed to ensure that it does not increase flood risk elsewhere". The detail of how this is achieved is appropriate to be covered at planning application stage.	No further action required
Page 26 PolicyHSA 2	The site is outside the settlement boundary, within the AONB and Manor Farm is part of the Conservation Area and there are less harmful options such as the land over the Franwill site.	David Latham, Margaret Latham, Mr and Mrs D Philpott	The options have been assessed through a Strategic Environmental Assessment. The larger Franwill option did not perform better when assessed.	No further action required
Page 27 PolicyHSA 3	There appears to be no advice from the NDDC Conservation Team on site HSA3 and policy criteria adopted	Historic England	<p>NDDC Conservation Team contacted to request advice regarding this site.</p> <p>Feedback received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No listed buildings</li> <li>• Outside of the Conservation Area</li> <li>• Within the Cranborne Chase AONB</li> <li>• Abutting an IOWA which covers the recreational field</li> <li>• Abutting public RofW to the east and north</li> <li>• Areas of archaeological Importance have been identified in the fields further to the north.</li> </ul> <p>This site is to the rear of modern housing and open to the countryside beyond which I believe I recall rises slightly to the west. There are long views out from the site with the building group known as Hammetts Farm to the south-west clearly visible and hence long views from multiple vantage points along the various public RofW back into the proposed development site. The plot projects west of the general settlement line for this side of the village. It is also noted that the land exhibits various depressions and mounds which</p>	<p>Include following as mitigation measures in line with NDDC advice:</p> <p>Reinforcement of hedgelines to provide screening.</p> <p>Layout to create a sense of enclosure within itself, in order to re-establish a new settlement line that defines it from the open landscape.</p> <p>Avoid large scale glazing open to the countryside to minimise light spill.</p> <p>Development to be representative of small-scale backland sites, with a stepping down in height on the outer edges.</p> <p>Public RofW links to be maintained</p>

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
			<p>may indicate potential archaeology, although not identified as such and it is recommended that DCC Archaeologist be consulted on this in terms of assessing any local or national value and hence constraints.</p> <p>Any potential development would be greatly exposed due to the lack of substantial existing hedgelines or screening. The development would need to create a sense of enclosure within itself, in order to re-establish a new settlement line that defines it from the open landscape.</p> <p>In light of the Dark Skies policy of the AONB, designs again would need to be inward looking to avoid large scale glazing open to the countryside.</p> <p>Limited scope for development here which would need to be small scale and low level, representative of backland sites and to attempt to mitigate the availability of long views and integrate it with the rural farmland setting. A stepping down in height on the outer edges is also recommended.</p> <p>Maintaining the public RofW links is also important.</p>	Archaeological assessment of site
Page 27 PolicyHSA 3	There is sufficient capacity on the network to support the proposed development sites, however significant development at the housing site “HSA 3 – West of Bakery Close” could potentially bring pressures below that of acceptable levels if connected to the low-pressure network without reconfiguration. The specifics of this potential reinforcement will need to be tailored to suit the proposal at such a time when more information is available.	SGN	Noted – this can be included as an advisory note.	Add the following advisory note below Policy HSA3: “Development in this location linking to the gas distribution network may require the low pressure network to be reconfigured - the specifics of this potential reinforcement will need to be tailored to suit the proposal at such a time when more information is available.”
Page 28 Policy SB	Consideration should be given to extending the settlement boundary to include the proposed housing allocations	Wyatt Homes	The allocation is not prevented by being outside of the settlement boundary. The preferred approach is for the settlement boundary to be revised through a	No further action required

Plan ref	Comment	Consultee/s	Consideration	Actions
			future review once the development is built, and in this way it will more accurately reflect the boundary.	
SEA	The SEA seems appropriate for the purposes	Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership	Support noted	No further action required
SEA	We have no objection to the SEA report	Environment Agency	Support noted	No further action required
SEA	The Minerals and Waste Plans preferred sites consultation has been recently published.	Blandford Town Council	The Dec17 pre-submission waste plan now includes site option WP17 adjoining Sunrise Business Park to be allocated as a waste management centre as no other suitable alternative sites were found. The site is over 1km from the nearest proposed allocation and much closer to residential development in Blandford Town. There are no minerals sites proposed in the area in the Dec17 pre-submission minerals sites plan.	No further action required
SEA	The assessment of reasonable options does not appear to have fully explored the options of the Plan allocating different amounts of land in relation to the housing need identified (in light of the potential over-provision against identified need).	North Dorset District Council	The Neighbourhood Plan identified supply is approx. 56/57 dwellings provides some flexibility and is not considered to be a significant over-supply for the reasons outlined above and given the assessment of the cumulative effects of the plan.	No further action required
SEA	The heritage conclusions in the SEA need to be substantiated regarding whether the sites, if implemented, are capable of avoiding harm	Historic England	NDDC Conservation Team comments received suggesting appropriate mitigation measures to include. They have raised no objections to the sites' allocations on this basis.	No further action required
SEA	The failure to assess land to the south of Letton Park as a possible allocation is a grave omission	Davies Coats families	This was not assessed as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative in delivering the plan's objectives. This is stated in the SEA	No further action required

Minor notes regarding typos and grammatical errors: on page 6 the title for the map runs over part of the text, making it unreadable

## Appendix 1 – Residents’ responses to the Options Consultation 2016

The following sections provide a brief summary of the key issues identified, residents’ responses and actions and amendments agreed:

### Vision and objectives

**Have we got the vision and objectives broadly right? If not, what should be changed?**

		<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	100	14	1

There was general consensus that the vision and objectives of the plan were correct with 87% of respondents agreeing.

The most frequent comments among dissenters related to traffic speeds, particularly on entering the village and questions over the extent of housing development required.

### Landscape character policy

**Do you agree with these general principles? If not, what have we missed or got wrong?**

		<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	98	9	8

85% of respondents agreed with the general principles of the Plan, with just 8% disagreeing.

Some respondents took issue with the desire to limit development on higher ground areas, claiming that much of the village is already based in higher ground areas.

### Green spaces

**Do you agree that all these spaces need to be protected? Tell us if we have missed any or got any wrong?**

		<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	97	11	7

84% of respondents agreed with the designated green areas identified within the plan, compared with just under 10% disagreeing.

Some respondents queried the retention of the old school field as a green space, believing that it could be utilised for in-fill development to reduce the requirement for development elsewhere and particularly beyond existing boundaries. However, others identified its potential for recreational use, suggesting that its central position should encourage greater participation than the Priory Sports Field.

Others questioned the necessity to include the grounds of private houses as protected green spaces. Private ownership itself was considered to provide a degree of protection, but infill opportunities should not be discouraged if so desired by the owners, and considered through normal planning procedures.

## Buildings

**Have we highlighted the most important buildings and features? Tell us what we may have missed or got wrong.**

		Agree	Disagree	Blank
Count	115	95	12	8

83% of respondents agreed with the designated important buildings identified within the plan, compared with just over 10% disagreeing.

Some respondents questioned whether the Methodist Chapel and Farquharson Arms buildings were particularly distinctive and worthy of inclusion as protected buildings, while others reported omissions such as Stud House. Others were less convinced over the architectural merit of some of the homes in Church Road, including the old Portman Estate buildings in Down Road.

## Design Criteria

**Do you agree with the design criteria? If not, what have we missed or got wrong?**

		Agreed	Disagree	Blank
Count	115	93	10	12

81% of respondents agreed with the overall design criteria identified within the plan, compared with less than 19% in disagreement.

## Housing

**Do you agree with the housing policy? If not, what specific housing needs have we missed or got wrong?**

		Agree	Disagree	Blank
Count	115	80	23	12

70% of respondents agreed with the housing policy within the plan, compared with less than 20% disagreeing.

Some respondents thought there should have been greater emphasis on the use of brownfield sites, while concerns were expressed about the potential build-up of traffic in certain areas, notably Down Road.

## Employment

**Do you agree with the employment policy? If not, what issues have we missed or got wrong?**

		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	83	18	14

72% of respondents agreed with the employment policy within the plan, compared with 16% disagreeing.

Although agreeing with the overall policy, some respondents remain concerned that development of the Taymix site should be restricted to maintain a clear gap between the village and Blandford. Others felt that there was sufficient scope for locating all employment south of the A354 and limiting business traffic through the village centre.

Respondents questioned the need to provide for more employment as Pimperne is not a working village and the amount of local people currently employed in local businesses is relatively low.

Others cautioned over applying too much emphasis on business and employment growth as this could increase local demand for housing.

## Community facilities

**Do you agree with the community facilities policy? If not, what issues have we missed or got wrong?**

		<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	88	8	19

77% of respondents agreed with the community facilities policy within the plan, compared just 7% against.

Concern was expressed about the lack of youth facilities, coupled with the poor transport links. Under-utilisation of the sports pavilion and Priory Sports field was also mentioned as a concern, with one respondent suggesting that transferring this area to the old school field could release space for further housing.

## Site Options

**Of the following options proposed, please rank each between 1 and 5 , where 1 = very suitable for development and 5 = not suitable for development**

	very suitable	<<<	neutral	>>>	not suitable		at least suitable (of those expressing an opinion)
Count 115	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Blank</b>	<b>%</b>
Land E. of Franwill Ind. Estate – smaller site	44	10	16	9	27	9	51%
Land E. of Franwill Ind. Estate – additional area	27	13	14	9	40	12	39%
Land N. of Manor Farm Close – smaller site	37	15	19	9	25	10	50%
Land N. of Manor Farm Close – additional area	22	10	15	7	49	12	31%
Land at top of Berkeley Rise – smaller site	28	29	13	10	22	13	56%
Land at top of Berkeley Rise – additional area	15	17	15	15	41	12	31%

The results show a preference for smaller developments amongst respondents across all three sites.

### Franwill Industrial Estate

**If land East of Franwill industrial Estate is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed (as set out in our overall conclusions)? If not, what issues have we missed or got wrong?**

		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	56	36	15

49% of respondents agreed with the issues identified in the plan, compared just 7% against.

Positive aspects of the proposed development area included the potential for a safe, walking path to the school. By far the greatest concern was over the potential increase in traffic on Down Road and Arlecks Lane, notably owing to the narrow roads. Some respondents, however, identified that the impact on traffic could be partly mitigated if relocation of the Franwill industrial estate to the Taymix area or elsewhere to the south and east of the A354 is considered.

### Land North of Manor Farm Close

**If land north of Manor Farm Close is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed (as set out in our overall conclusions)? If not, what issues have we missed or got wrong?**

		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	71	31	13

62% of respondents agreed with the issues identified in the plan, compared 27% against.

Even amongst those who agreed with the key issues were concerned over the possible build-up of traffic in Church Road, with road widening considered to be a key requirement.

Those who disagreed with the key issues identified the following concerns:

- Increased traffic, particularly at the beginning and end of the school day, and possibly poorer visibility around a severe bend.
- Increased flood risk
- Ribbon development at this location would change the character of the approach to the village from the North.
- Insufficient evidence had been presented that building on lower lying land was preferable to higher areas.

### Land at top of Berkley Rise

**If land at the top of north of Berkley Rise is allocated for development, do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed (as set out in our overall conclusions)? If not, what issues have we missed or got wrong?**

		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	84	17	14

73% of respondents agreed with the issues identified in the plan, compared 15% against. Among those who agreed with the key issues, some respondents identified that development at this location would be least obstructive owing to its location on the edge of the village, while others suggested that suggested development would be no more visible than that proposed at the Franwill Industrial site. The main concerns for those who disagreed related to traffic issues, particularly during construction. There was also concern that any development in this area would reduce the “gap” with Blandford and could undermine the argument against Blandford +’s plans for expansion.

### Discarded sites

**Do you consider that the Neighbourhood Plan Group were wrong to discard any of the others sites)? If so, which ones should be reconsidered and why?**

		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	70	33	12

61% of respondents agreed with the issues identified in the plan, compared 29% against. Amongst those who disagreed with the planned discarded sites, the main issue was that housing development in the Hyde Farm area over the A354 should be considered, particularly re-using the existing buildings if development could assist in obtaining a safe crossing over the A354.



## Area South of Taymix

**Do you consider that the small extension south of the Taymix should be included as an employment allocation (and therefore not part of the important open gap)?**

		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	69	32	14

60% of respondents were in favour of a small extension to the Taymix site, compared with 28% against.

**If allocated for development do you agree with the issues that need to be addressed (as set out in the overall conclusions)?**

		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	87	14	14

76% of respondents agreed with the main issues, compared with 12% against.

There was overwhelming concern that the gap between Pimperne and Blandford should be maintained wherever possible. Even the possibility of one of the possible benefits of such development, a lower speed limit between Blandford Forum and the village, was queried as it could serve to undermine the feeling that the two places were separate entities.

**Do you consider that the Neighbourhood Planning Group were wrong to discard the larger extension to Taymix? If so, why?**

		<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Blank</b>
Count	115	70	33	12

61% of respondents agreed the group were right to discard the larger site extension, compared with 29% against.

The main reasons for dissent related to the belief that such development could reduce commuter traffic through the village, and would reduce the speed of vehicles entering the village, while providing extra local employment opportunities for residents.

## Appendix 2 – Residents’ responses to the Supplementary Consultation June / July 2017

Ref	Sites Comments	Gap Policy / Settlement Boundary / Other
1	Speed of vehicles is my only concern	Important gap is a priority
2		Keep the gaps
3	Don't agree with further development but the three small sites have less impact on surroundings	
4		Bought house on basis of settlement being settled and unhappy that it is being re-drawn
5	<b>Franwill</b> Franwill site should just be for housing. Industrial units introduce smoke and noise into an otherwise residential area <b>Old Bakery Close</b> If AONB's choice is land west of Old Bakery close I agree with this as it has least impacts the village.	
6	<b>Franwill</b> Any development here would need to look at road widening. Traffic has already increased because of the gym. I already spend a great deal of time reversing up Down Road and Arlecks Lane and it is frustrating.	Do not agree. If needs be houses could be built on left hand side of main road when heading to Blandford
7	<b>Franwill</b> Concerns over road access to Franwill site. Arlecks Lane is already too narrow to accommodate construction traffic. Bottom of Down Road is a pinch point with room for only one vehicle at a time. There will be considerable disruption during the construction period.	
8	All 3 sites appear not to overwhelm the village. I would hope there would be some affordable housing to encourage a younger generation.	
9	Are the dwellings needed? Spread the sites into 6 and introduce imaginative construction including self-build	
10	<b>Old Bakery Close</b> Access via Priory Field could limit parking there and could mean more parking in Old Bakery Close	
11	<b>Franwill</b> Reservations about road access <b>Manor Farm Close</b> Reservations about the road access from Manor Farm Close	
12	<b>Franwill</b>	

Ref	Sites Comments	Gap Policy / Settlement Boundary / Other
	Access to Church Road needs great consideration <b>Manor Farm Close</b> Access to Church Road needs great consideration	
13	Will the infrastructure of the local town cope with all the extra buildings? <b>Old Bakery Close</b> Impact will be enormous affecting outlook and devaluing our property, also causing a huge amount of mess	
14	Does Pimperne really need this many houses? <b>Manor Farm Close</b> Should be kept as open space as it is beautiful and presents a good view of village and Church.	It is difficult to approve or reject
15	<b>Old Bakery Close</b> Lack of access via playing fields and nursery school would be greatly affected	
16	<b>Manor Farm Close</b> Further development here will have a negative impact on the outlook of the village. It also provides an opportunity for further future expansion.	
17	Consideration of school places, GPs, dentists. Housing design should be in-keeping with rest of village. <b>Manor Farm Close</b> Development should not be too close to existing development.	
18	<b>Franwill</b> Agree with new boundary <b>Manor Farm Close</b> Existing open field is highly valued, not only by MFC residents <b>Old Bakery Close</b> Agree with proposals	
19	It would be nice to see some affordable housing for local people	
20	<b>Old Bakery Close</b> Would there be a requirement or opportunity to relocate the sports fields slightly further away from village? Flying cricket balls already cause problems and these could increase for the proposed new site and the access road.	Has account been taken of provision of local jobs for new residents? Would it be possible to provide a development for older people?