

Policy CC

response from	Text error	Factual error	Policy reference	Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
89514068			CC			Renewables we should be looking at the modern development of cheap corkscrew hydro. The area was first populated because of its water power. We should re harness it.			
89717956			CC			CC1 presumably this does mean ALL new development incl the smallest. CC2 use of jargon but seems OK CC3 too much of jargon CC4 if it can be achieved CC5 but where is the evidence to justify the "weather forecast" statement?			
90020760			CC			Renewable energy does not work. The wind blows for only 25% of the time. There is minimal sunshine in winter when the energy need is greatest. How do you propose to solve this conundrum? We had the world's most efficient and cleanest electricity generation and it has been sacrificed on the alter of 'global warming' Do not waste even more money foisting even higher energy prices on the old and poor. I speak as someone with an environmental science degree and two decades experience of the energy sector. Go for energy efficiency as a means of reducing costs not tackling non-existent 'climate change'. Science is not and never was about 'consensus'. With consensus you get no Newton, no Einstein etc! The last time we had such a consensus in science we believed in the luminiferous ether. 'West Dorset emissions are above the national average' because farm animals produce lots of 'greenhouse' gases. This would need to be a whole town effort and an acceptance that more cycle/footpaths will not prevent people using their cars - more public transport!! See the electric bus in Dorchester.			
90306539			CC						
91154474			CC			a waste of time unless political will to see it through			
91644627			CC			Silver Birch should be planted around new developments because thay are known to absorb carbon.			
Bradpole PC			CC			Much reference to carbon emission controls but build requirements should also take account of rising summer temperatures. These build requirements are currently lacking in the UK.			
93491094			CC			The renewable energy industry is moving fast, battery walls, solar tiles etc will all start to become available.			
93309179			CC			Climate change is at the forefront of most thinking. Th UK is seeing more extreme weather events now with higher rainfall that increases the flood risk. Climate change is a direct result of burning fossil fuels but with a reduction can be reversed. Although a global issue, if each community makes some changes the cumulative result is massive. Every effort must be made to make new buildings, both residential and commercial, as energy efficient as possible exceeding that required by building regulations.			
93296195			CC			Sounds lovely but we all know that developers cannot be trusted. They say all the right things to get what they want and then do their own thing. There needs to be real consequences to not complying not just an exchange of money for someone else to do the costly work			
93267771			CC			CC4 & CC5 particularly important. The new developments' impact upon the surrounding area and existing housing / landscape should be considered - ie not creating flooding problems.			
93092785			CC			Flood risk is a major issue for parts of Bridport but the developments planned (eg Vearse Farm) will inevitably result in worse flooding. No matter what flood risks are identified major strategic developments will go ahead one way or another.			
93084039			CC			There is no excuse in 2018 for new buildings that fail to meet the highest environmental standards and don't include some renewable measures. Policies should distinguish between things like solar panels and heat source pumps (which are low visual impact and to be encouraged) and wind turbines (which would be very visual in this location and should not be encouraged).			

92586471	CC	How will the vision of ensuring energy efficiency in new developments be reconciled with the need to provide good quality housing for those on lower incomes - as noted on page 15 of the pre-submission document?
92288839	CC	I think awareness of climate change in all things we do is essential. There are some interesting ideas for incorporating this awareness into new homes and I would like to see these given importance in new developments.
92140378	CC	All new houses need to be more sustainably built. Flood risk assessments need to be better and take into account the hilly nature of the area. More building in higher areas, means more run off which does not affect new buildings, but can affect the older ones down stream or further down the slope. This is never taken into account.
92137682	CC	On-site generation just for the sake of it is not necessarily the best option for national energy production
93648460	CC	The global effects of climate change have been very obvious this summer, and we are all responsible. Low Carbon Housing can be as cheap or cheaper than the standard traditional builds and are also cheaper to run, thus helping the lower-waged people in the area while reducing the areas carbon emissions. Good design and planning are essential for this to happen and a move away from doing things 'because its always been done this way'. The balance between traditional ways and the global needs should be re-dressed.
93629098	CC	I wholly support these fine initiatives and would encourage support through and advisory service to households on their ability to contribute positively to slow down climate change.
91181815	CC1	all new development proposals should be required to make a positive contribution.
93529939	CC1	Is anyone really interested?
91181815	CC2	MINIMUM 19% reduction
91139069	CC2	why specifically 19%? it is not explained.
93529939	CC2	Anything energy efficient usually means buildings are concrete, glass and steel i.e. eyesores which is totally contrary to protecting the landscape and blending in with the environment.
89350775	CC2/CC3	The objections are because they don't seem to go far enough and don't appear to include the vast majority of extant properties. Again no concrete proposals/metrics for these.
89228003	CC3	Policy CC3 needs further explanation especially if you do not know much about the energy regulations/requirements
91139069	CC3	: "Merton Rule" should be explained in a footnote.
93529939	CC3	What does this even mean? Wind Farms? Solar Energy?
Symondsbury PC	CC3	we don't understand the implications of this
90026786	CC4	CC4 The Dorset Energy initiative is an excellent exampe of this and should be extended. With public money?
91181815	CC4	There should be an additional clause, d) The proposed development shall not have an adverse impact on the amenities, services or quality of life of residents in neighbouring areas, nor on neighbouring areas of environmental importance.
91139069	CC4	Individual energy generation is out of place in a section on Neighbourhood-wide schemes.
93529939	CC4	Of course new development will have an adverse effect. Infrastructure cannot cope now.
93452747	CC4	should be reworded to be more specific about adverse impacts. Adverse impact should only prevent a community renewable energy scheme when they are significant and would clearly outweigh the benefits of the proposed scheme. There should also be a more proactive emphasis on encouraging community and small scale commercial renewable energy schemes in the plan area.
Symondsbury PC	CC4	we are not sure that this is flexible enough

90702227	CC4 a)	The siting and scale of the proposed development shall be appropriate to its setting and position in the wider landscape. That sentence is very subjective. For some people that would mean no turbines. I would try and give more weight to the need to develop renewables. Once people become used to seeing wind turbines they might come to see them as beautiful, and realise they are necessary. You could say "with due weight given to the expected catastrophic consequences of climate change, and the duty to exploit the relatively cheap form of onshore wind energy" (or something!)
93700192	CC4 b)	Any large residential development will have an adverse impact on the amenities of residents. The reasons have been spelled out repeatedly.
91181815	CC5	is there a requirement for developers to make their assumptions in adherence to standards set out in a particular, nationally/internationally recognised, climate change projection? If not, there should be.
93529939	CC5	will not work because local authorities ignore the fears and concerns of residents. West Bay/Vearse Farm are known flood plains but building is still authorised. I have worked in the Medical Centre and watched the flood water come almost to the staff car park.
93700192	CC5	Given the unpredictable situation of both current and future rainfall levels, any assumptions about flood risk are meaningless. No risks are worth taking. A lot of fine words. However they need to be achieved and maintained - not watered down.
93865940	CC	
93820756	CC	Bridport has many listed buildings, which are currently not permitted to install solar panels, even where they would not normally be visible. Strict planning rules should be relaxed in this respect.
94044543		The measures taken to reduce the carbon footprint are very inadequate as there are many new areas of global warming that are kicking in as the climate warms leading to exponential growth in global temperatures. We should be aiming for much higher reductions of the carbon footprint than are currently being proposed.
Symondsburys Estate		Policy CC4 should be amended in sub paragraphs b & c to refer to any 'unacceptable' adverse impacts. Most development will have adverse impacts and therefore the test, as currently framed, is too high.
		Because of the climate changes due to global warming, I feel we should try to hang on to every bit of agricultural land. Caravans and mobile homes could be placed on agricultural land and moved away as required. We have not got enough land to provide all the food we need and are dependant on other countries for this most essential resource. Who is to say what problems will occur in the future? Water and energy are our other main problems, together with population growth nationally and globally.
		To achieve these aims 1) NHS and other social services must be provided more locally and not grouped as seems present policy in East Dorset (i.e. Bournemouth and Southampton). 2) Public transport must be greatly improved. How else to stem the growth and use of private cars?
93884001	CC	
93885380	CC	Far too much emphasis on climate change, I am a believer but there are more important pressing issues for Bridport viz lack of social housing.
93881104		The aspiration targets for carbon reduction look to be realistic. Shops should be awarded for their carbon footprint, Local businesses values should reward energy efficient shops etc.
93784246		
93734143		Totally support the Climate Change Strategy. Checks and balances do need to be in place to ensure all new developments meet these requirements both during planning, build and ongoing for a number of years and a schedule of fines developed for those not meeting the original approved plans.

93723011		<p>Bridport is a forward-thinking town. The climate change policies listed here express a commonsense approach and clear understanding of what will be required and why, for the enablement of a sustainable neighbourhood.</p>
93732666		<p>Bridport Climate Change Strategy What is it? What does it actually mean? Does anyone know? Does anyone REALLY care? A few years ago the post office ceased used of cycles for post delivery in Bridport, they now run a huge fleet of leased, imported diesel powered vans, more pollution, more congestion, has the T.C. contacted the P.O? Have they objected to this negative change, I assume not. The T.C. talk of cutting pollution/carbon but do nothing at all in reality.</p>
93730008		<p>I would like aesthetic considerations to be taken into account in providing renewable energy. The vast fields or solar panels, with associated barbed wire and notices, look awful on the Dorset/Devon border near Hawkchurch. CC4 - I am pleased to see that the siting and scale of any proposed development shall be appropriate to its setting and position in the wider landscape.</p> <p>Aiming is not the same criteria as achieving. Flood risk assessment - shouldn't all developments have flood risk as standard? I believe that an important factor in reducing climate change is reducing single car journeys by more regular and out of hours bus services. I also believe the craze in vaping is something that Bridport should reduce/not support to reduce pollution</p>
93727632	CC2	
CG Fry	CC1	<p>The requirement for an energy statement is not a local or national validation requirement and is not in conformity with the adopted Local Plan. Such a requirement should be made on a consistent basis across the District. Limiting its requirement to one part of the District will create confusion for applicants. Even if this point is rejected, a blanket requirement for an energy statement for "...all new development proposals..." is excessive and should be sought for specified proposals only. The policy requirement should more properly be tested through the adopted Local Plan review.</p>
Cg Fry	CC2	<p>The requirements set out at a) and b) are not appropriately evidenced or justified. They are not in conformity with the adopted Local Plan. Seeking a reduction on Building Regulations Part L can only be encouraged; it cannot be required through policy.</p> <p>The requirement of Policy CC3 for at least 10% of unregulated energy from decentralised or low carbon sources is unevidenced and is therefore unjustified. Its effect on development viability and delivery has not been adequately assessed. Accordingly, this requirement should more properly be assessed through the review of the adopted Local Plan, not addressed by a neighbourhood plan forming only part of the overall administrative area covered by the adopted Local Plan.</p>
CG Fry	CC3	<p>Part a) is not clear about what it requires of applicants. Flood Risk Assessments and surface water drainage strategies are already required make allowances for climate change.</p>
CG Fry	CC5	

Policy BTC

response from	Text error	Factual error	Policy reference	Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
89717956			BTC			BTC1 Like the theory but don't know what the classes mean. BTC3 pity it has taken so long to regenerate St Michaels in view of what has now happened. Perhaps this is the kick start it needed although sorry for the tenants affected. BTC5 like the idea of quarters, very European, hope it happens. Cyclist & pedestrians are mentioned, what about mobility scooters (a particularly British issue) which are an increasing problem on our pavements			
			BTC			BTC6 Have you looked at East, West and South streets? A mass of charity shops and estate agents. Hardly 'quality'. Try taking simple actions now such as stopping the likes of WH Smith and Number 10 leaving their rubbish on the pavements. Instead of removing street furniture try planting out the various planters around town which are currently strewn with weeds The map on page 25 includes Downe Street, Barrack Street etc in the 'Commercial Quarter'. These areas should be protected from any further commercial development and where possible returned to the residential use for which their Georgian builders intended them			
90306539 90828803			BTC BTC			BTC4 & BTC7 - depends. No more non-commercial development in town unless to use existing flats over shops etc. Churchill and the Church Street development have increased traffic. Plenty of potential to improve the appearance of the bus station etc but not to remove car park spaces. The toilets are disgusting. BTC1 - yea but shops too. BTC7 - Development Yes.			
90828803			BTC			Agree with the idea of re-balancing the priority of cars over pedestrian access to South Street from East/West Street. This is slow for pedestrians right now and rather hazardous. Suggest that cars going West to East are encouraged to use the By-pass. With Park and Ride facilities for visitors coming into the town at 3 gateways. Could we consider pedestrianising South Street on Market days? Development of Barrack Street area excellent idea and St Michael's workshop need developing and tidying up a bit - renovated if possible. Each areas character needs developing.			
91392087			BTC			Do not exclude private vehicles, movement of cars in the town, or make the centre pedestrian only. Which will change its character and effect movement from one side of town to the other. Do not reduce traffic flow and widen pedestrian flow. Barrack Street should be pedestrianised.			
93544547			BTC			The focus on cyclists and pedestrians at the expense of cars is laudable but futile. Bridport has an ageing population who will neither walk nor cycle relying on car or public transport to get to the town centre. The speed of traffic through the town is already self limiting and any attempt to reduce the traffic flow will lead to chaos. This has already been seen many times when the A35 has been closed and traffic is forced through the town centre.			

Symondsbury PC	BTC	We know this is a major issue, but provision for further parking is missing. Most commercial properties are not owned by the operators, and therefore it is difficult to see how they can be persuaded to improve their properties when they are more interested in rental income than the need to be aesthetically pleasing.
93309179	BTC	Bridport has a wide range of independent local retail outlets along with national chains. It is the twice weekly market, the range of independent shops and the atmosphere of the town that attracts shoppers from further afield. This delicate balance must be maintained in order to generate the income (and employment) that the town needs to remain viable. The town has a vibrant and active arts scene with 3 Theatre/Cinemas in addition to the entertainment offered by the pubs and restaurants within the town. This 'buzz' attracts visitors from further afield especially when big name entertainment is on offer. Bridport must develop, the world does not stand still but any development must be sympathetic with the town as it is and not be to the detriment of it's appeal. The existing car parks need to be retained with the Bus Station being enlarged alongside the redevelopment of the St Michael's area. The Bus Station is the entrance to the town and should enhance and attract visitors to the town.
93296195	BTC	Totally support the emphasis on small, independent and unique businesses to retain the character of the town. Also the emphasis on retaining a link to the history of Bridport whilst being modern and relevant. We do not want to resist change to the point of dying.
93267771	BTC	Keen on BTC6, shopfronts, makes a lot of difference. Bit cynical about W Dorset's attempts to hang onto Bus Station Car Park, we do need parking here. Was inclined to object because of this, although decided on DK in end, because of attempt at mitigation!
93137524	BTC	Policy BTC7 Clause a) 2. is very important in my opinion
93092785	BTC	Bus station/rope walks - car parking is a massive issue and increasing problem as the large amount of planned development hits the town over the next 10 years. Congestion into Bridport is a real problem especially along West Road. These sites should only be developed if the same amount of parking spaces are kept & further spaces provided at other locations.
93084039	BTC	Much as I like Bridport's charm, the public realm could do with some improvement, to smarten up the pedestrian areas and make it seem less dominated by vehicle traffic. Almost certainly have to retain car parking space. There is no alternative for most around here and people would probably just shop in another town if they couldn't park.
92586471	BTC	We need greater diversity in the town centre. Currently all that is being expanded is the cafe culture. We need businesses/facilities which encourage the involvement of young people. It's good to see that students at Colfox have been involved in this pre-planning process. Could this be expanded to include our primary schools?
92358695	BTC	Try to ensure that public toilets are well maintained (and signposted for visitors). And, (after recent fire) to ensure that St Michael's workshops are restored and supported.
92358695	BTC	

92288839	BTC	<p>In the not so distant past, there were a few more crossings in East and West Street. These made access through town less easy for traffic and easier for pedestrians. To make this quarter more accessible for pedestrians seems a good idea. Would sending more traffic out onto the by-pass cause more problems there, though? I can't see there being less traffic in the area anytime soon. The owner's ideas for St Michael's Trading Estate seem to address the need for housing and local jobs. The area at the moment certainly seems very run-down.</p> <p>maintaining the quirky nature of Bridport is vital to its future success - so supporting the art business sector is important BTC6 preserve Bridport in aspic and not allow any evolution. Whilst I support maintaining the style and character of Bridport, change and evolution must be allowed</p>
92137682	BTC	
93648460	BTC	<p>There are many people who have spoken to me about the value of individual, independent businesses and how they are the heart of Bridport. Many would like to see improvements to eg, Oxfam, Superdrug, with ugly buildings particularly above shop fronts. While shops have to conform to the Disability Discrimination Act I would like to see more creating better access for wheelchairs users. The loss of the original window from the Pizza shop by the bus station is criminal and I'm pleased that these policies would encourage reinstatement of the 1950's style frontage.</p>
93629098	BTC	<p>A general comment: the commercial quarter shop frontages look a little tired in places with poor design and signage which requires incremental improvement to retain or re-instate the character of the town.</p>
93700192 90828803	BTC 3 b) BTC1	<p>the proposed development of the St Michael's Estate is of concern. How will existing workshops/studios/ businesses, function when works commence? How will public access be maintained within the guidelines of health and safety? What control can be exercised over the suitability of new building design for the development? yea but shops too</p>
93440723	BTC1	<p>A description of A1, A2, A3 and A4 uses would be helpful in deciding whether to support policy.</p>
93529939	BTC2	<p>Already have small units but unfortunately due to high business rates/rents Councils are killing them off</p>
coft	BTC2	<p>we suggest the policy is reworded to make specific reference to commercial activity of local trades and service businesses such as plumbers, electricians, vehicle garages, builders, building merchants and trade suppliers, manufacturers and IT and digital based businesses.</p>
91181815	BTC3	<p>careful monitoring of the status and direction of St Michael's post-fire is needed.</p>
Bradpole PC	BTC3 b)	<p>The reference to floor space should take account of the agreed planning where the residual workspace area is c.7500M2</p>

91139069	BTC3a	Will it be allowed that existing studio space can be redeveloped into something else provided the developer makes available equivalent space elsewhere?
91181815	BTC4	cycle ways need to make sense, and signposted well to be sure to be actually used... the new one on Sea Road North is an example of one which does not (so far).
93529939	BTC4	cyclist in town? they are a menace to pedestrians. No sooner do you remove the vehicular hazard then you mow everyone down by cycles!BTC5 Pedestrians and cyclists do not mix. Until cyclists are required to take out insurance and pay to be on the roads (those who refuse to use the expensive cycle paths) then they should not be anywhere near a pedestrian. If you close the roads to vehicles then most of the shops will object because of deliveries. It is impossible for every store to get a delivery at a time when the road is accessible. As regards shopfront design this is a wonderful idea because all of the shop frontages looked far better in their original state. If they are forced to revert will they be able to afford it and will they receive assistance? How did the new Friths shop get permission for the hideous sign they have erected over the previous very tastefully designed I. J. Brown fascia? The Weymouth branch is a lot smaller and blends in better. This is outrageously ugly
89350775	BTC4/5	just following a mantra for pedestrianisation and pushing traffic problems away "somewhere to the edges of the town" - possibly due to the commercial partners engaged with this consultation and the "cookie cutter" solutions often offered by these groups.
93642825	BTC4/5	I am concerned that the plan is weighted too heavily in favour of cyclists and pedestrians, that concentrating so heavily on these will result in motorists being deterred from coming into Bridport. People will go elsewhere to do their main shop, local businesses will suffer from a reduction of trade
8922803	BTC5	I don't particularly like the quarters, I think it would be better to mix things up and to have a variety of things in each quarter. At the moment I don't visit the quarters such as St Michael's as I don't find them appealing.
90026786	BTC5	BTC5 {a} A mix of use can work well. I guess we have all found the best restaurant or pub in a town is in the most unlikely location. Must not end up with an arts or industrial 'ghetto'. too many areas are dangerous to older/less-able pedestrians, mainly through uneven surfaces. In icy conditions, pavements should be gritted as well as roads.
91181815	BTC5	
91139069	BTC5f	is grammatically out of step with the rest and it reads oddly although the aim is clear.
91181815	BTC6	owners/tenants with existing modern shopfronts, where particularly stark or ugly, should be required/encouraged to ameliorate the look by way of suitable decor/baskets etc. Point 6, provision of storage or refuse bins, should have recycling bins added
91139069	BTC6a	It is not clear to me how clear street numbering is relevant only to the disabled

BTC7 Bus and coach station toilets. Although generally clean are not really of a 21 century standard. The first stop, and therefore the first impression, for a visitor to the town is often the toilet.

the number of parking spaces, of sufficient size, CANNOT be retained on site if Rope Walks and adjacent car parks are redeveloped for mixed uses. There is already insufficient parking in town, particularly on Saturdays, we cannot afford to lose any more.

making improvement to bus services a planning requirement is laudable, but unless it is quantified in some way I think it will just be swept aside. Doesn't BTC7 overlap with AM6?
Does this conflict with policy AM6?

Another farcical suggestion - with bus services diminishing or disappearing and no rail link, villages will still be isolated and people still need cars to get anywhere

- in addition to the current wording we would like the policy to include a section stating more specifically that any proposal for redevelopment must include an impact study regarding access to and from any proposed development from existing vehicle and pedestrian in the wider town centre vicinity, such as the East Street mini roundabout, Gundry Lane, St Michael's Lane, and South Street so as to ensure any development will not cause further congestion in the town centre.

improvement no re-development. There is a need for low business rates. Shop front design needs to be monitored and controlled. Dominoes Pizza got away with removing the iconic sloping windows of the former cafe Royal completely changing the look. The bus station needs to be a transport hub. At present, many of the buses just stop in the town causing congestion. Public transport, as I knew it, has vanished and as an older person I can no longer even walk to the bus station even though I would like to. With current retail premises closing is there in fact a need for BTC7 - improvement no re-development. There is a need for low business rates. Shop front design needs to be monitored and controlled. Dominoes Pizza got away with removing the iconic sloping windows of the former cafe Royal completely changing the look. The bus station needs to be a transport hub. At present, many of the buses just stop in the town causing congestion. Public transport, as I knew it, has vanished and as an older person I can no longer even walk to the bus station even though I would like to. With current retail premises closing is there in fact a need for more stores.

Any redevelopment of the Ropewalks Car Park will destroy trade in West Street and part of South Street. Even a temporary closure would be unwelcome.

Agree with the idea of re-balancing the priority of cars over pedestrian access to South Street from East/West Street. This is slow for pedestrians right now and rather hazardous. Suggest that cars going West to East are encouraged to use the By-pass. With Park and Ride facilities for visitors coming into the town at 3 gateways. Could we consider pedestrianising South Street on Market days? Development of Barrack Street area excellent idea and St Michael's workshop need developing and tidying up a bit - renovated if possible. Each areas character needs developing.

			St Michael's Trading Estate is an eye sore and a mess. It needs significant development. The Town Centre Quarters need to be attractive areas that visitors and locals want to visit - Bridport and West Bay need to be given a face lift and be more cheerful areas to visit. If a coach load of tourists visited where would they go? What would impress and what would they remember.
	91392087	Quarters	
Bradpole PC		Quarters	There are likely to be views for & against but BPC considers that overall our residents would SUPPORT this concept.
	93296195	Quarters	As long as there is equal attention and financing of all areas. I wouldn't like to see certain areas getting the lions share at the cost of other areas.
	93084039	Quarters	Rather like the quarters idea, even if it is a bit simplistic. But what practically will it mean?
	93648460	Quarters	The outline plan should help to give each part of town an individual atmosphere and improve the town for all especially with good signage for tourists.
	93640180	Quarters	Commercial Quarter - object to narrowing the road as it will increase congestion and pollution.
	91139069	TC Quarters	The St Michael's quarter needs not to emphasise the current preponderance of Antiques dealers, because these are a fashion and may already be fading. Instead it is the ability of the area to support local small businesses, traders, artisans and crafts which should be the focus. "Artisan" may be a better word.
	93497005	TC Quarters	But in a subtle rather than signposted way. I would support the pedestrianisation of the lower part of Barrack Street St Michael's workshops and studios are a significant part of what makes Bridport different from so many towns If the owner could knock down and replace the OXFAM shop it would help the townscape considerably!
	93491094	TC Quarters	We feel that potentially this might limit development of certain businesses, and that it could be too prescriptive. It appears to be more of a marketing tool than a planning operation.
symondsbury PC		TC Quarters	The definition of the Town Centre Quarters will help lead visitors to the parts of the town that interest them.
	93309179	TC quarters	
	93243956	TC quarters	Don't agree with the 'quarters'. Bridport Town Centre is defined in our charter. The three streets from the town hall to the bridges West , East and South. South Street, West Street and East Street all consist of a variety of shops, all have market stalls. St Micheal's has more than art and craft workshops and antiques. There are many financially successful business, past and present from this quadrant. All trades and a variety of businesses should be supported. It is good that West Bay is treated separately.
Cof T			Page 18 onwards, Bridport Town Centre chapter - we found the inclusion of St Michael's Trading Estate in two separate sections confusing (note: St Michael's is spelled variously as 'St Michaels' and 'St Michael's' through the section). Would this section be better applied in the Economy & Employment chapter of the plan?
			When describing Bridport Town Centre in general we would like to see reference to the commercial importance of local trades and service businesses such as plumbers, electricians, vehicle garages, builders, building merchants and trade suppliers and manufacturers based locally and in all core town quarters, including St Michael's Trading Estate. The description of this area in particular as 'arts and artisan' belies the fact that there a number of trades operating from this town centre trading estate as well, who deserve recognition and protection for their future business success.
CofT			
	93865940	BTC4	I am not really sure what this means and what it would look like. There is a lot of talk about cycling however I see more people in motorised mobility vehicles than on bikes and their not mentioned.
	93865940	Quarters	When I came here in 1984 St Michael's Trading Estate was scruffy then and looked derelict. Now in 2018 it still looks a mess in the town centre. The bus station has needed a face lift for years. As tourism is key for the towns economy it is time they were improved.
	93820756	BTC1.	What do the aforementioned A1 - A4 classes mean? .
	93820756	BTC7 a)	. This policy should exclude any multi-storey car parks
	93799196	BTC6 -	I fully support the preservation of the original fabric and sympathetic restoration but it will not square with the disabled access, which will ruin it.

We have enough places for food and drink. We need to retain our small individual shops to keep the town interesting for locals and visitors alike. Development in Bridport town centre should be kept to the minimum to retain the rural environment. Shop front design should be in keeping with the town as a whole to keep its past history. Car parks and bus station are needed to keep the town alive, we need more parking for visitors and locals (on street parking is a nightmare).

Regeneration usage of new retail is good, however to turn the car parks into retail areas is not required unless they were for multi-storey car parks. Plus an integrated public transport and park and ride would be the greatest asset.

St Michael's workshops and antiques quarter - change of emphasis in the contents suggested name of the quarter of "St Michael's workshops and antique quarter". Rename is unweildly from tenants view of the estate it is not a very attractive address or easy to use in promoting the area. The area has for a number of years been designated "Art and vintage quarter" following the fire and dispersion of a number of artists to other places it is now appropriate to be named 'Artisan and Vintage or Artisan and Heritage Quarter' It is not just antiques and the business units are more diverse and therefore artisan is more inclusive. The idea of "quarters" is excellent.
BTC6 - 3 - Why have large open shop fronts with heating wafting out into the street. Keep heating inside (global warming!).
If you narrow the carriageway, the tail backs of traffic will make the town completely unapproachable. Close South Street instead to Gundry Lane. Don't let St Michael's area change. Tidy up, smarten the bus station area. Don't allow any West Bay atrocities take over this area. Try not to make the 'quarters' of the town too distinct, rather blend together.
I'm sure if I can support or object as I'm not clear on the BTC4, 5 and 6 and what it exactly means

Surely wider pavements with result in the traffic being slower and therefore giving off more pollution!? Tests of pollution carried out by myself and Friends of the Earth last year on two different sites on East Road (where traffic is slow) were 10 over the recommended limit! 2. I am in support of improving/changing the rough, scruff area of St Michael's - but would want to maintain the character and atmosphere around the Red Brick Cafe etc.

Under Bridport Town Centre Quarters reference is made to Gateways to Bridport However the Northern gateway is not mentioned. It is a very important gateway to the town which has been much damaged by the architecture of the Travis Perkins and Lidl buildings. These are directly opposite to a conservation area whose inclusion in planning was "delayed" until the TP and Lidl buildings were in place. Thus enabling their being passed at the time. There seems to be no policy for the northern gateway. This is a serious omission. The Small business policy should include promotion of businesses being run from home many of which are computer/internet based. They increase the diversity and technical knowledge of the town as well as being run by people of working age many with families attending the local schools etc. The rural aspect of the town which has views to open country is an essential aspect of the town centre. Thus potential developments in the surrounding area need to take into account the impact on the town centre experience. Under commercial quarter east and west street. There is no attempt to offer a shared space concept to this area. This would reduce traffic obstruction increase pedestrian usage and further develop the character of the town as a friendly and human place to be in. The whole area needs to be paved over as is proposed or Barrack street and become a shared space where people actually make eye contact between vehicles and pedestrians and negotiate their movements with each other. This is much more efficient than traffic lights to keep everybody and everything flowing. The above also applies to South Street and the town hall junction. The question needs to be asked: how much time is the space at the town hall not used? This would instruct calculations on traffic flow and better average usage by both vehicles and pedestrians.

It is essential that the mix of small businesses located in diverse premises through the areas is supported.

Am concerned that if top of South St is closed to motor vehicles, traffic from the west wishing to go south will be forced to use the Sea Rd North and South roundabout, thus adding to the already congestion in Sea Rd South especially during holiday times.

Am assuming "current" means as from 7/9/18. Public car parking spaces have been whittled away bit by bit in the past, eg electric charging points in East St car park; police cars in Bus station car park; inadequate toilet block in South St car park.

you should normally allow temporary banners for advertising events, activities etc. the biggest thing stopping people coming to shop in Bridport is not the lack of local shops or diversity of offer but car parking. Try as you might to encourage public transport our elderly population and out seasonal visitors will come in there cars so we need to there is adequate parking - be creative - underground parks? low rise car parks? cars driving round the town in a search or parking really bungs the place up Try to have free parking on quiet days to encourage those who can to come into town outside of the busy weekend? appropriate use for town centre shops should include and A5 uses in addition to A1, A2, A3, and A4. a blanket ban on the enlarging or merging of shops risks reducing the range and quality of shops in the town centre and affecting its vitality and viability. This policy should be deleted and each case judged on its merits.

the retention of artists studios and artisan workshops should be judged on its merits as its retention may prevent acceptable development unnecessarily due to issues of viability. Criteria to this effect should be included in the polic proposals for new car parking should be priced to be accessible to all residents and visitors. The policy for Town Centre quarters should not be rigidly enforced in terms of land uses. It should allow flexibility to encourage innovation.

I have lived in and around Bridport all my life (58yrs) and I am against any more changes to the main streets. They have been changed over and over again and the fact is we are pretty much in the same position as we were 50 yrs ago so nothing has helped. The town needs clear trafficeways for businesses to be able to thrive. Bridport is not just a town of wealthy incomers and artists; there are a large number of ordinary working people on low incomes who need to get from A to B in order to provide for their families. It is of no concern to them how many coffee shops/cafes we have and it is not desirable to have a pedestrianised town centre. Before my parents died they were both severely disabled and the wide streets were a godsend if I couldn't find a space. People are very kind when they realise you have a wheelchair and occupant to get onto the pavement but I don't think that would be the case if the traffic was brought to a halt because there is no space to drive around them. Leave it alone. Make a few directional changes as Victoria Grove clearly IS working. eg No right turn from Downe Street or mark the road with directional arrows - people turning right regularly block people trying to turn left. Absolutely no parking outside the Market Place or the left lane anywhere up to the traffic lights. Parking there causes huge backlogs - I have very recently witnessed someone parked outside the town hall opposite the shoe shop and beyond the traffic lights! These are the places that need to be policed. I hate it. Why does it have to be in Quarters? I find all of this type of design jargon very pretentious without any real purpose.

The Town Centre quarters are a good way of focussing on certain activities or needs. The town as a whole should never be forgotten when weighing up situations.

Out of town supermarkets and online shopping seem bound to dictate. Who will be able to occupy town centre shops as they are already starting to do. For the centre of Bridport to remain attractive to locals and visitors as you emphasise the provision of parking is essential. Is Bridport large enough to give up streets to traffic free zones? They can cause increased congestion elsewhere. Provision of parking in new developments is essential. I think anything done must be part of the whole conception and not piece-meal. One worries that development elsewhere will raise the risk of flooding in West Bay area. Post-war development round the harbour has not been kind to West Bay and much is beginning to look tatty.

93881918	BTC5	depends on development. Retain small retail outlets in the centre of town, and a strong policy to discourage large out of town development, e.g. supermarkets, shopping malls. We need to encourage in town facilities to limit the use of cars. I personally think that charity shops should be encouraged as they promote recycling and affordable products.
93881104	BTC	Bridport Town Centre is a special place. It is important and in many ways unique. It hosts an amazing number of community, arts and music events. The plan seeks to protect the things that make Bridport special and promotes good design which is in keeping with existing architect. The town centre policies should protect the history and rich heritage of Bridport and avoid the mistakes of other councils which has seen too many historic town centres lose their identities and their high streets die.
93865431	BTC5	seems under-thought, with too narrow a perspective - emphasis on pedestrians and cyclists. What about disabled access, for instance? [Mentioned in AM1, does that cover this?] . And public transport (mentioned later,too). The 'identities' of these four quarters is a bit arbitrary although admittedly useful, for organising ideas and plans but difficult in terms of architectural homogeneity, for instance. It seems a bold (and over-confident? so sure of no loopholes or points not considered?) statement to say that ANY development meeting BTC5 WILL BE SUPPORTED.
93865431	Quarters	Okay, but not inspiring nor particularly inspired. Why do we need Quarters? Is it so we can designate geographical areas for discussion and consideration purposes? Why have they not been needed in the past? What are we gaining beside a convenient system of 'labelling'? Explain a bit more, please.
93802365		Maintain charity shops - not only are they essential for individuals and families on a small budget, they are also environmentally responsibly reducing landfill and encouraging re-use. I do not support any movement of the street market to a 'designated area' it must be left as it is to maintain Bridports character.
93802093	BTC7	The proposed redevelopment... that has been subject to a wide consultation with residents and businesses in the Bridport area; the feedback from this consultation should indicate a majority support for these proposals" (in order for them to be enacted.) I strongly feel that the proposal to allow development, particularly on the Ropewalks car park is fundamentally flawed. This car park in the main destination car park for those housing adjacent shops. Bridport high street has a flourishing market and many small independent retailers, in large part due to both residents and visitors being able to access this car park. Waitrose is a very successful supermarket (unusually) in the middle of a high street. This also draws people into the high street, who then subsequently spend money on other outlets. Bridport has a greater proportion of elderly residents who can manage a short walk from a well placed car park, but who would be cut off from the high street both as a retail and a social experience, without this provision. This would have a detrimental affect on them. Bridport high street (again unusually) has bucked the trend for high street closures occurring elsewhere. I think this is precisely because we have a successful mix of national chains (such as Boots) and local independent retail and catering outlets. To close this car park would be to cut of the life's blood of the high street. Then Bridport really would start to seriously decline instead of being the vibrant lively popular place it is today. Although I appreciated West Dorset district Council may be looking for ways of raising funding. I think this would be a very short sighted and disastrous decision. The present flourishing retail outlets will continue to pay business rates. The popular attractive town of Bridport (with the high street at its heart) will continue to attract new residents all of whom will be paying rates. A town in major decline due to this short sighted decision will be economically limited and a lasting reproach to the folly of short term fiscal interest. Shame on you West Dorset please don't make this last act a terrible, inevitable legacy of decline and deprivation.
93784246		Let empty shops be used - rate free - for genuine new young business. Every "entrepreneur" should be given extra support.
93782324	BTC1	Policy hard to understand. Has any consideration been given to a park and ride scheme for the town?
93782324		Independent outlets (cafes, shops etc) should be encouraged across the town, including in the commercial quarter. Rates should be designed to facilitate independent outlets.
93734143		It is not clear what A1, A2, A3 and A4 mean in the document, maybe a short description will be useful?

The proposed development of St. Michaels will, according to The Plan, result in "25% less work than now". I have a grave concern that short-term economic gain for a few is being prioritised over longer-term developments which would retain the character and spirit of Bridport epitomised by St Michaels current blend of artistic and commercial development. It is precisely this mix which attracts visitors. The policies all demonstrate a clear understanding of how Bridport works and how things work for Bridport, and the care that is needed in order to keep its strengths and success as a vibrant and functional town, whilst preserving its history and character and keeping it 'healthy' in all respects. Interesting to think of the town this way, which I hadn't before particularly, but it makes sense, and may be sensible to pursue.

The Town Council seems to be very 'muddled' in its thinking regarding the Town Centre. They claim to be concerned about the air pollution caused by stationary traffic but do nothing to reduce levels of pollution, they seem to think more parking spaces is the answer! Surely this will simply increase traffic levels and add to the congestion? They also run a fleet of diesel vans themselves, rather hypocritical when by definition the 'Town Council' only need to make short journeys. In the town area, ideal I would think for electric vehicles.

Bridport at present a very dirty poorly maintained little town, the litter strewn, weed infested streets and pathways are a disgrace, the roads are in a dreadful state and when the new 'Dorset' Unitary Council is eventually formed it will have a backlog which will take decades to deal with.

It is important to allow a flow of vehicular traffic through the centre of town so that there is an alternative route available if the surrounding roads are blocked. There should be a balance between the requirements of drivers and pedestrians with patience being exercised by both. Most of us still need our cars to carry the shopping home. If we have to reach the car park by a convoluted route, more petrol will be used, not less. The pavement could be improved for those who walk with wheeled mobility aids, the uneven pavements and "bobbles" which help blind people located crossing points make life very difficult for friends of mine with walking aids. I DO NOT support the redevelopment of car park sites, even if the current amount of car parking is retained. This would involve years of disruption and result in future competition for current local businesses already affected by the growth in internet shopping. ery important that public transport links are improved and cyclists and pedestrians have priority. much more could be done to make the pedestrian/cyclist/user of public transport a priority. Car parking always seems to be priority. Car parks are vital for the town please don't risk killing the town by inadequate parking facilities.

Fewer drink/food outlets. -Fewer charity shops - Enhance car park and bus station

While we have we hope provided considerable input to the neighbourhood plan through 'consultative meetings' and ongoing correspondence with Phyllida Culpin and others, we are concerned that St Michael's, its development and regeneration and its future role in the community may not be fully represented in the finished plan, particularly in terms of how it is presented/described.

It is important to emphasise that in the Local Plan St Michael's is designated as a mixed use development on a brownfield site. The Town Planning Association describes Mixed Use developments thus:"Mixed use developments, particularly on brownfield sites, are seen as key to the creation of a diverse urban and town based economy, creating a critical mass of activity; increasing employment opportunities and introducing the local population to more vibrant, lived in spaces. While this may feel like 'town planning speak' it is nonetheless a fair and accurate summary of our vision/strategy/plan for St Michael's and needs to be captured in the Neighbourhood Plan.Mixed use developments blend residential, commercial, cultural and industrial uses so they are physically and financially integrated."

93773781

93723011

93723011

Quarters

93732666

93732666

93730008

BTC4/5

93727632

BTC4/5

93727632

BTC7

94046016

BTC4/5

94046016

Haywards & Co

Haywards & co

We notice that the feedback from the Chamber of Commerce asks this question about St Michael's 'Would this section be better applied in the Economy and Employment chapter of the plan.' Yes and No is our view in that the regeneration and development of St Michael's impacts at every level in Bridport and therefore can be included in a number of chapters. It certainly would be a mistake for example to only include it under housing.

The Economic, Employment and Regeneration Report, submitted as part of the outline application approved last year, is a 96 page document which emphasises the specific employment opportunities, skills and jobs offered by the scheme. We must also emphasise that St Michael's is first and foremost a TRADING estate and that as an estate it offers a base to a complex and diverse mix of businesses; a formula that we wish to see retained and enhanced. We are not convinced the current draft places enough recognition of the importance of this element.

Mention must also be given to the many benefits the scheme offers to the 'public realm' in town planning terms – new walkways and roads, a riverside walk, a river island open to the public and we hope an enhanced interface between the estate and the Bus Station area, not to mention affordable and social housing. We commend these points to the steering group and ask that we might see at least a change of emphasis in the contents of the report in its references to St Michael's.

We would hope that policy BTC1 does not adversely impact on the use of use classes 1, 2, 3, and 4 in other appropriate locations, for example St Michael's Trading Estate

Policy BTC6(a)(3) appears to be missing a word at the end – perhaps “street scene”?

We suggest that, if available, detailed guidance on best practice in the application of policy BTC6(a)(5) be provided to developers/applicants. This policy also makes reference to street numbering – is this a requirement relating specifically to people with disabilities? If not, should it be shown as a separate sub-policy of BTC6(a)?

Haywards & Co

Haywards & co

Haywards & Co

BTC

BTC1

BTC 6 a 3

BTC 6 a 5

We propose that a new policy be added that prevents the use of internal illumination of shopfront signs throughout Bridport. Bridport Town Council's Planning Committee has in at least the last 12 years objected to internal illumination of shopfront signs, with the support of the Conservation Officer. We consider that this should now be incorporated into a written policy as part of Policy BTC6(c)(2), suggested as follows: Proposals for internal illumination of shopfront signs will not be supported

BTC

Policy AM

response from	Text error	Factual error	Policy reference	Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
89717956			AM2			Too much parking on some streets is both a concern and a danger.			
90306539			AM			Town edge parking should not include Asker Meadows. Without local transport covering local villages including Bothenhampton can use while not decrease - reliable public transport is the key to a calmer town - note East Street on most days. No more unofficial roads - nb Mountfield since the Churchill Development and Agincare - quite a high volume of traffic entering Rax Lane now - this is a public open space.			
90306539			AM			Enough cycle and footpaths already in place - no greater use noted in spite of all the money spent especially on the cycle path and the end of East Street. Street for all is usually a shambles - some people behave if we already have it. It all comes back to public transport with links to stations and running in the evening.			
90755525			AM			No mention in the text of the cycle way from Maiden Newton to Bradpole - important longer link. Needs pushing to achieve.			
90828803			AM			I support each of these plans. The development of Architectural models and sustainable transport - cycle and foot paths to schools avoiding heavy traffic are essential. Transport hub a very good and fundamentally necessary idea off which other ideas can flow naturally.			
p.a.oneill@btinternet.com			AM			Public bus services are mentioned, and point 15 in access and movement mentions the bus station. I would like buses and the lack of them to be considered. As a user, I do not find them very reliable, they are costly for people that pay, and they are not regular and generally are not available in the evening. If we want to encourage people to move away from cars, I think buses, especially smaller, reliable, cheap and a much more regular service would encourage people to use them. What's the alternative? They are not used at the moment, except by people who do not have a car, and even then very often the bus is not the first port of call for the reasons stated above. Please do consider this point, it's no good having a wonderful bus station with few bus running			
91392087			AM			The bus station is difficult to access and causes pollution through road blocking. It needs to be near the town centre but not in the centre with access only from the North.			
91644627			AM			This area definately needs better public transport, any way of enabling it?			
93529939			AM			It would be wonderful to have pedestrianisation, however it is totally impractical. Due to the nature of the town and its shops, deliveries arrive at all times which sort of negates the idea (see Weymouth) It is no good having a partial pedestrianisation scheme because pedestrians are still dodging vehicles. (again see Weymouth)			
93497005			AM			Note that the tourist nature of the town means that we get motorhomes coming into town and we need to provide parking so that they do not park on the town streets (as happens when the spaces in the bus station are unavailable during the carnival). There are very good examples of edge of town motorhome parking in tourist towns in Gloucestershire, for example.			

		Overall very sensible proposals but any restrictions on town centre traffic will result in vehicles using Skilling, Victoria Grove, N Allington etc as 'bypasses' Out of town developments will result in increased vehicle movements and parking requirements. How many people walk into Bridport from Bradpole, Walditch etc particularly if they have a young family. Is a survey on this needed? In the introductory section there is mention of restricting the three lanes for better pedestrian access. That makes sense heading west where three lanes aren't really needed but would cause chaos heading east. I can't see a mini-roundabout working there because of the poor sight lines past the town hall. Access to most of the car parks is through or near the centre and needs to be considered. The overflow car park by the Brewery is a disgrace and needs resurfacing.
93491094	AM	
93452747	AM	Additional measures to support the use of electric cars and buses should be considered, including priority parking spaces. A more ambitious approach is needed over the longer term to remove all vehicle traffic from central Bridport.
93544547	AM	The emphasis on pedestrians and cyclists is misguided and should not be the essential focus of changes to the town centre. Granted we must ensure that those using this form of transport can do so safely but not at the exclusion of other forms of transport. How many cyclists use the new cycle way on Sea Rd South for example. As said earlier Bridport has an ageing population who will not readily take to their cars and tourists will not arrive on bikes. There needs to be a recognition that pedestrians ,cyclists and cars can live together because you will never in the lifetime of this plan eliminate the car. For me it is far more important to link AM3 and AM6 and have a parking strategy that does allow cars to get to the town centre easily and to have enough spaces. No redevelopment of the Waitrose carpark for new retail sites which are not needed in the town.
93309179	AM	There are no bus services closer than a 10 minute walk from my home that is 15 minutes walk (downhill) from the town centre so public transport and cycling are not an option for me. I need to drive to the Medical Centre as well as to The Bridport (as well as Dorchester and Weymouth) hospitals. Traffic on the A3066 has been increasing rapidly over the past few years making it difficult to turn right onto Sea Road North from St Andrews Road. For this reason If I need to travel east, south or west I have to drive through the town centre. Ant changes to traffic movement within the town centre will have a direct impact on my ability to travel and may well increase my isolation. Whilst the road through Bridport town centre (East Street, ~West Street) separates the 2 sides of the main retail area I don't see how any traffic management schemes can alter this. With the Hospital and Medical Centre on the west side of the town centre locals from the North, South and West of the town must travel through the town. The bus station does not provide visitors to Bridport with a welcome and the public toilets adjacent urgently require refurbishment. Both the bus station and the public toilets need refurbishment to a high standard to reflect the area of Bridport. Bridport lacks sufficient car parking, these should be no reduction in the provision of parking in the town but an increase particularly in the area around the bus station. Any attempt to build a multi storey car park must be resisted as it would be detrimental to the architectural nature of the town
93296195	AM	This is well thought out, recognising the needs of all users. Clearer signage could ease town centre traffic as there is car parking available on major entry points.

Bus station as a hub badly needs doing. I do actually use buses sometimes and a proper interchange would be great. Overall speed limit for town of 20mph. There are places where the pavements are so narrow or non-existent, that you have to walk in the road. Try and keep cars away from the minor roads and discourage development that would have a major impact upon minor roads that were never meant for heavy traffic. (!). Cycle network - conditional support, given poor use of Sea Road North. AM5, yes developer should contribute to infrastructure and overhead costs - S106 is never enough! AM7, how would you actually rationalise car parks?

Although we recognise the importance of a general move toward a reduction in the use of motor vehicles, the chamber feel the importance of retaining existing, and possibly temporarily increasing, parking provision should be highlighted, as the loss of any parking areas in Bridport would cause a significant threat to the popularity and commercial success of Bridport as a thriving tourism destination town.

n my view replacing the traffic lights is not a good idea. Reading the number of accidents that happened before they were put in in 1935 leads me to this conclusion - I don't believe that much has changed. The area is too small for a roundabout considering the lack of visibility when approaching from the south. Increasing the number of bicycles with pedestrians and mobility scooters will cause problems, but society will decide the mix, encouragement will only have a minor effect. Cars are going to be the major form of transport due to the demographics of the local population. An elderly and affluent population will use cars as long as they can afford them. Reduced access to the town centre by motor vehicles will kill what the plan is trying to preserve at least in the lifetime of this plan.

Policy AM3 is very important in my opinion

good policies - BUT - car parking strategy has to be to increase to cater for the existing needs and increased needs with planned developments. Make the developer of Vearse Farm pay for a park and ride scheme (too late I know as WDDC did not have the foresight to demand this). Footpath/cycle policy - has to be focused on safety and some routes into Bridport (eg West Road) are not safe for either. To really deliver on this policy requires major road and infrastructure spending which the council/WDDC etc cannot afford and developers won't pay for.

92697084	AM	<p>The present population, discounting summer season tourist visitors, generates local traffic that includes bus and coach services, agricultural vehicles, and vehicles servicing local manufacturing and retail activities. This aggregate traffic is sufficient to cause tail-back through the Town. In particular, traffic volume at the junction of South street with West-East streets has already reached within a very small margin of "saturation". Housing development approved or very likely to be approved by WDDC, if realised on the ground, promises an increase of at least 1350 units*. This equates to an increase of 3,000 in the Area's population. Before even half of these units are occupied, traffic in the Town centre will reach and exceed "saturation". Saturation means continual tail-backs and blockages such that thenceforward all development must halt. * more likely 1600 (to incl Watton Village) This is such a major shift in the needs of the community, it seems inconceivable that the Draft Plan when presented to the public for assessment would not recognise this and discuss how the consequences can be dealt with.</p>
92697084	AM	<p>To satisfy parking needs within Bridport today demands some radical action. Visitors to the Town centre should be catered for by a fully 'serviced' transport hub at the present coach station off West Street. Many older people use the centre and all existing car parking facilities at the centre are needed and more. Reports in local media have shown that some visitors arriving in the Town by private vehicle find that there is nowhere to park their vehicle, so they drive out of Bridport to go elsewhere. Consequently, those visitors may be unlikely to drive into the Town for quite a long time, a matter of years. How can the economy of the Town be sustained and developed in this circumstance. It hardly needs saying, that local residents could become very annoyed. Let us recognise that traffic will increase, so to preserve the historic centre and layout of Bridport, some radical thinking is needed. Access to the Town can only follow roads. Apart from the A35, most roads leading to Bridport are long-established lanes (formerly farm tracks) that are now stretched beyond practical capacity. Development of any of these routes to solve these problems would necessitate very significant and costly infrastructure projects. (NB Paper provided on addressing car parking)</p> <p>Maintaining paths are vital. Car parking shouldn't override existing creative businesses.</p> <p>Continue to request that towns car parks be handed over to Bridport Town Council!</p> <p>These proposals seem to address the need for easier access for everyone to the town centre. On Saturday mornings, walking around the town can be quite hazardous. I am unsteady on my feet due to a peripheral neuropathy. Having to dodge prams, mobility scooters and dog leads is quite scary!</p>
92382072	AM	
92358695	AM	
92288839	AM	
92140378	AM	<p>It would be nice if the crossing which used to be between the Town Hall and the one by Leakers was reinstated. It is easier to cross there than at the Town Hall, which is confusing. The island enables people to cross without holding the traffic up on both lanes. If the car parks are developed, what happens while this is being done? From personal experience people shop else where and do not return. Older people may be willing to walk but not able. Younger people seem to be able - but not willing.</p>

92137682	AM	<p>These plans have contractions within them. We want to develop Bridport as a vibrant and quirky town yet if we want development it must adhere to some restrictive and strict requirements. I think this Plan should tackle lack of parking and traffic movement in a totally innovative fashion. Be positive and say 'we will do it'. The solution must be affordable to both residents and developers - if we make their life too hard, they will develop another town. My solution would be to invest in park and ride with regular bus cycles. But there must be 'experts' who can come up with something better.</p> <p>I have 'objected' because the plans do not go far enough in promoting public transport. There is no mention of improving bus links for example, which is a severe problem currently</p>
91970522	AM	
93648460	AM	<p>The present bus station, as people's first view of Bridport if arriving by coach, is disgraceful, depressing and gives a poor welcome to tourists. It needs to be seen as Bridport's shop front and as such could be lively, fun, practical and welcoming. The use of the many skills of local artists and crafts people could make this area a lively extension of the St Michael's quarter and set the tone for the rest of the town. An (electric) car club would be welcome.</p>
93629098	AM	<p>More encouragement and facilities for cycling and walking are essential. There is an over reliance on car transport even in the town centre which detracts from the enjoyment of the area, creates pollution and results in traffic congestion. More walking/ycling routes on which cyclists feel safe and supported are required.</p> <p>reduction from 2 to 1 lanes for traffic coming up West Street would cause cars, waiting to turn right down South Street to block the free flow of traffic from West Street down East Street. Cars would be brought to a standstill increasing air pollution. Has the increase of coaches from the proposed development of the bus station, and the increase in cars from Vearse Farm development, when it is completed, been factored into narrowing the roads through Bridport? There are problems now with the traffic flowing through Bridport I recently caught X51 Dorchester, it took the bus 15 minutes to get from the roundabout at the bottom of East Street to the bus station. Any future plan to pedestrianise South Street would direct traffic down to the A35, at the roundabout adding more vehicles to the traffic of ten already at a standstill.</p> <p>I find it impossible to understand why the TC feels it necessary to remove car parks for building sites when there are already insufficient car parks. If Vearse Farm goes ahead as it no doubt will the town centre will be gridlocked for about 6 m of the year</p>
93642825	AM	
93569387	AM	
93569387	AM	<p>Ive yet to see more than 5 people using the SeaRd north cycle lane. A complete waste of money and many months of inconvenience to drivers</p>
89239711	AM1	<p>It is said that the number of over 70s in the population will rise quickly in the next few years. There is scant mention of how this section of the community can be helped to remain an active force in the town.</p> <p>Alongside those walking and cycling we need provision for mobility scooters too.,The addition of more taxi spaces for those able to walk short distances to shop on foot but not carry provisions home should be thought about and access for elderly/disabled to all the wonderful arts venues maintained or enhanced.</p>

AM1: start by enforcing current laws by stopping people young and old riding bicycles on pavements meant for the exclusive use of pedestrians. Going forward keep the two apart. Drop the electric vehicle nonsense. If we all drove electric vehicles the country could not generate or transmit the energy required (yet another inconvenience the renewable lobby conveniently ignore). AM6: there is no point wasting money on a transport hub for ever decreasing public transport. Am7: see electric vehicle comment above.

AM1 Better signage for pedestrians, particularly visitors. Encourage the use of routes other than the three main roads. Exeter is a good example with signs that show 3 minutes to Cathedral.

is ambivalent in saying "Make possible or not hinder". "Enhance" is better

Sledge hammer approach - does not allow for the elderly and others

Streets for All. Proposals for new development should not be looked at in isolation. The large Vearse Farm project will have a major effect on Bridport town, but what will its effects on town traffic magnitude and flow, parking requirements, air quality, noise etc, be compounded when combined with housing to be built at St Michael's, development at the old Flood Lane site, and other sites yet to be identified? Thorough, joined-up, forward thinking is needed here

Is there likely to be improvement to public transport? Bus companies seem more concerned with cutting routes, rather than expanding them. AM2 - Within reason!

Unrealistic - if every able-bodied person cycles the cycle path will be rendered unfit for purpose. Where will the bicycles be parked in the town centre? Not blocking the pavements which need to be clutter free

No inclusion of apparent provision of better bus services which have been decimated by recent outsourcing/contract decisions. Good the bus station will be "improved" as a "hub" but if no buses what's the point?

As many older or disabled people live in the area, they will not be able to easily use park and ride or other schemes where shopping must be lugged around so reduction in access to shops and facilities will disadvantage them significantly.

does this mean road vehicle traffic? If so it should say so. of course, there needs to be adequate public transport.

We have concerns that in the rural areas of the NP boundary this policy may curtail development, if public transport is not available, and is unlikely to be providable.

Didn't understand AM3. There's a real need to improve the bus station. A pretty terrible advert for the town, when visitors arrive. AM6 appears to overlap with BTC7. If they are intended to be different they need to concentrate more clearly on different aspects of the need for a bus station.

90020760	AM1
90026786	AM1
91139069	AM1
93640180	AM1
91181815	AM2
93642825	AM2
93640180	AM2
89350775	AM2/AM6
89350775	AM2/AM6
91139069	AM2a
91181815	AM3
Symondsbury PC	AM3
93084039	AM3
91139069	AM6

93700192	AM6 b)	Mention has been made elsewhere of a proposed residential and retail development on the Bridport bus station site. This section of the area plan suggests an expansion and consolidation of the site as a Transport Hub (hopefully with some parking retained) which seems more useful. Bridport has no need of more retail premises further to those extra units proposed for St Michael's i.e. small affordable spaces, unattractive to the large chain retailers.
Symondsbury PC	AM7	we wonder whether it is possible to provide an audit of the 'informal' parking spaces, such as those on roadsides on the approach to the town centre. This may well be covered by AM7 1, which could identify more space which could be used.
cofT	AM7	please could the wording be clearer, the meaning of 'rationalisation' in this context is not apparent.
93642825	AM7	A high percentage of Bridport residents are retired, many with mobility problems. Car parks need to be within easy reach of the shops. The Ropemakers car park behind Waitrose is a good example - remove this and people who do their main weekly shop in Waitrose will probably be forced to shop where the car park is adjacent to the store, and shop out of town. The independent traders are the ones who will loose out in the end Signage needs to be small to reduce street clutter.
93640180	AM7	
93865940	AM1	While the provision of public transport remains worse then poor people are obviously going to drive if they are too far from the main shops to walk. AM1 - 3: Vital - people with mobility issues requiring walkers, wheelchairs, electric mobility scooters do not seem to be given much consideration for - 1) parking - being able to open doors wide, access to the boot with sufficient space around. 2) Enough dropped kerbs for people pushing wheelchairs and prams. 3) sufficient dropped kerbs so people on mobility scooters do not have to go along the road. 4) cars should be on the road, not parked with wheels on the pavement. You do not see cars with wheels on the pavement in Bromley or Bexley - they get a £60 fine...but not it appears in Bridport.
93851072		Unclear as to what car parking strategy really is. Following the development of the old Magistrates Court area into a very large retirement block rather than making it a much needed extension to the existing car park I fear priorities may not be in favour of utilizing existing possibilities.
93799196	AM/AM7	I walk everywhere and I think the existing streets and paths perfectly adequate. Even crossing East, West and South Streets is only time consuming on the traffic lights, as they take so long to change. It's very easy to cross at any other point of these streets at any time of the day. AM5 is extremely vague. Of course, maintaining the new paths is going to be costly for ever and a one off contribution 'in appropriate cases' is not going to solve the problem. AM7 - point 1. , what does it mean? moving the car parks somewhere else?
93813643	AM	Connections from rural villages is important for people who don't drive getting to town for shopping, meeting friends or special days in Bridport is good for the community. I can not walk from home to Bridport, I do not use a bicycle but I think the path network is a good idea. Car parking needs to be improved not taken away visitors, coaches will not stop if they cannot park. We need the bus station to stay, it would be nice if it looked better than it does at the moment. West Bay is very much improved.

93806877	AM1 3/4	AM1 - 3- I find mobility difficult and am very concerned about the state of pavements outside the town centre. AM1 - 4-Bus companies can't make their services pay so who will subsidise them?
94044150	AM4	Foot path and cycle paths need to be clearly defined. Cyclists still ride on narrow paths never using a bell to warn walkers even though there are all the new expensive cycle tracks for cyclists to use them! I would like the new path on Sea Road North to be clearly divided for walkers and bikes.
94044543	AM1	should include encouraging car sharing schemes and bicycle hire facilities. Comments on Shared Space above are repeated here: Under commercial quarter east and west street. There is no attempt to offer a shared space concept to this area. This would reduce traffic obstruction increase pedestrian usage and further develop the character of the town as a friendly and human place to be in. The whole area needs to be paved over as is proposed or Barrack street and become a shared space where people actually make eye contact between vehicles and pedestrians and negotiate their movements with each other. This is much more efficient than traffic lights to keep everybody and everything flowing. The above also applies to South Street and the town hall junction. The question needs to be asked: how much time is the space at the town hall not used? This would instruct calculations on traffic flow and better average usage by both vehicles and pedestrians
94044543	AM3	It is essential that sustainable transport actually accesses the town centre directly instead of skirting it making journey times very long before finally arriving at the town centre. The use of smaller vehicles as was historically the case would facilitate this.
94044543	AM4/5	A lot has recently been done for shared cycle and footpaths. More needs to be done. However there is a very significant omission for pedestrians themselves. The omission is the lack of refuges for pedestrians on roads with significant not to mention high volumes of traffic such as the A 35 and St Andrews road which is devoid of refuges from the Co-Op to Gore Cross a distance of three quarters of a mile. This splits the community in half and substantial number of residents live on both sides of the road. The developer contributions must not be used for arguments with the District Valuer to reduce the number of social housing or affordable homes in a development Paths used by both cyclists and pedestrians need to be properly maintained after rain eg path across Asker Meadows and path from Burton Rd to West Bay can, in places, become inaccessible for pedestrians.
93910108	AM	
93910108	AM2	Pedestrian crossings at Town Hall traffic lights were unnecessary - there were already perfectly adequate crossings in West and East streets.
93910108	AM7 4	Sounds as if more car park spaces will be lost - until public transport greatly improves we can't afford to lose any more spaces. <div> <div> simply put people cannot park their cars in Bridport on busy mornings and the town loses trade. you must maintain the number of car parking spaces available and possibly expand them. one way of encouraging bicycles would be to have better more obvious bicycle stands/storage in town and to put some bicycle lanes down to try and stop drivers behaving badly towards bikes </div> </div>
93901051 Symondsburys estate	AM	
	AM2	
Sym estate	AM7	
92249247	AM	the policy in AM2 (4) should be to reduce speed in the town centre. parking should be priced to ensure it is available to all residents and visitors Generally transport policy should seek to ensure the maximum number of residents and visitors are attracted to Bridport town centre. Policies to change transport modes should not discourage people from visiting the town Centre Phrases like 'aim to' and 'will be sought' have no meaning in law. I resist and object to any proposals to pedestrianise any town centre areas without any real viable alternatives for motorists.

93891367	AM2	One of Bridports attractions is the Street market. At present there are unsatisfactory features which I understand the District Council is well aware of. As soon as the District Council has truly taken over the management role and believe they will make sure that access and safety issues are optimised
93891367	AM4	Even if one is in the habit of walking from home to town (or cycling) on a regular basis, bad weather may encourage one to do otherwise. Once a person is retired they may make plans which take into account the weather. In other words they needent go out if the weather is bad. Taking redundant or broken electrical items to the distant recycling centre is a problem if you haven't got a car. (Perhaps this could be looked into.)
93881104		The 'streets for all' policy is important to ensure that new developments do not adversely impact existing communities with inappropriate access or by unreasonably increasing traffic flow and speed.
93865431		Need to ensure there is plenty of BICYCLE PARKING that is appropriate to the identity of the town whilst still accommodating the projected increase in number of cyclists and their needs. Town responsibility and/or shared with businesses and residential developers? This is for the whole are of the Bridport Plan - Sounds like the focus is the town. What about impact, for instance of out-of-town parking areas, for links into the town - the impact? Any way to restrict the number of pets being towed along on our streets? They make it particularly difficult and dangerous for young children and older people.
93802365	AM1/2	As long as the market is not moved. Respect of green belt land - no new roads.
93734143	AM6	the redevelopment of the bus station as this is no longer in keeping with the individual character of Bridport. This area is sometimes the first view visitors get of Bridport and needs to present a more welcoming, appropriate view of the town. Public transport services have been dramatically reduced over the years. These cuts make a mockery of many of the goals set in this plan for anyone who does not have a car. And yet one of the aims is to make Bridport more pedestrian and cycle friendly by reducing a need for people to use cars!
93773781		Very unclear and weak, meaningless.
93732666	AM6	Air quality. Bridport is choking on filthy traffic fumes. Due to non existent traffic management, cars sit nose to tail from the Town Hall to East Road and pollute as they do so. The chance to close off South Street and remove the signals at the Town Hall was an opportunity missed. Shame on those fools who voted this down, have they never been to South Street, Dorchester? (Item 4) at the moment there is ONE! Electric Vehicle point in Bridport. There needs to be at least 4-5 in every car park in town. NOW, not in 10 years time. I note the Town Council run a fleet of imported diesel powered vehicles. Not a very good example! Why not Nissan electric vehicles? (Nissan NV200 vans are made in the UK, Sunderland plant.) Much better for the town and a good example for others driving in town.
93732666	AM7 3	
93730008	AM1	I frequently walk around Bridport and have never had any problem as a pedestrian due to wide pavements and numerous crossings. I don't see any need for further prioritisation over cars. (However, as mentioned above, some of my friends with wheeled walking aids are driven into the road by the state of the pavements.)
93730008	AM7	The recent improvements in the footpath network are a constant source of pleasure. I have yet to see much use being made of the new cycle path on Sea Road North - most cyclists appear to continue on the roads; we may have lost the strawberry clovers that used to grow along the grass verge for very little benefit
93727632	AM4	Need to be more proactive in promoting and increasing footpaths, not passively 'resisting' their decline.
93727632	AM7	Need to resist making car parking the priority.

94046016	AM3	Particularly to/from railway stations life still goes on after 7.15/7.30 when the buses stop. - Reintroduce 1 local bus service to surrounding areas and Bridport, Walditch etc (Bus service no 7 - Wessex).
CG FRY	AM1	The requirement in 1 that pedestrian movement is made a priority is inconsistent with the adopted Local Plan and the NPPF (July 2018), which require that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued, with walking and cycling prioritised.
cg FRY	AM2	The requirement under 4 that development should not increase significantly traffic speed is unreasonable. Traffic speed will depend on a range of physical off-site circumstances that planning policy and individual developers cannot control. The requirement that development should not lead to a significant increase traffic volume is not consistent with the adopted Local Plan and the NPPF (July 2018). Part 4 should be amended to require that adverse effects are mitigated
CG FRY	AM5	Policy AM5 should specify precisely when contributions will be sought. It is unclear as drafted.
Bridport Event comment		Bridport needs to be more bike friendly - what can be done in general? West Bay Road is particularly dangerous for cyclists (footpath on on the West side) Make West Bay rd. a one way road so vehicular traffic goes into West Bay via Marsh Barn Road and out via West Bay rd. Make one way roads for cars 2 way roads for bikes.
written comment		When you plan to increase the number of electric charging points, PLEASE do not use disabled spaces. I find getting down to the bottom of East Street very difficult with those two spaces converted to electric use. And invariably empty!
written comment		Plus, please remember those of us whose opportunities to enjoy Bridport are limited by disability. No hat festival for us, unless we can afford a mobility scooter as well as a car. The two disabled spaces outside the hairdressers in South Street are poorly signed, and the two opposite, outside the computer shop, are often full - sometimes with vehicles driven by the able-bodied.
Highways Agency		We are satisfied that the plan's proposed policies are unlikely to lead to development which will adversely affect the operation of the trunk road. We therefore have no specific comments to make but we welcome in general terms the focus throughout the plan on improving facilities for walking, cycling and public transport provision thereby reducing the reliance on the private car. We are also supportive of those policies which seek to protect and enhance local facilities, services and employment space which again will help to reduce car trins.
BTC	AM2a	Policy AM2(a)(4) would benefit from the provision of detail in the definition of the terms "traffic" and "significant". As indicated in question 3 above, we are anxious to ensure that objective judgements can be made when assessing development proposals
BTC	AM5	We consider that the default approach in Policy AM5 should be that developer contributions should be sought, unless the developer provides satisfactory justification for not making a contribution
BTC	AM6 b	proposals should ensure a connection not only to the town centre, but also to the proposed riverside walk and nearby residential areas.
BTC	AM7	the Town Council would support the inclusion of a requirement to provide a café/information point, and retention of toilets. The development should also provide demonstrable community benefit to the NP area

BTC

AM7

We request that consideration be given to the inclusion of a clause under Policy AM7, to the effect that new developments in the plan area should help, or as a minimum not undermine, the objective of achieving park and ride services for Bridport

Policy EE

Training and Employment Housing availability relates quite closely to the need for training of younger people in lower cost units such as those to be found on St Michaels trading estate, some having been destroyed by a recent fire. Only with training can these people earn sufficient to begin to buy a dwelling. Apprentice schemes need to be established by which experienced and skilled workers in Bridport Area can pass on these skills to younger people who then stay in the Area and become the future management of local businesses. This is also all about how to create attractive work situations where young members of the Bridport Area community can be encouraged to stay in Bridport, not 'emigrate' into one of the housing estates for several thousands of people being established outside say Exeter. Quite why so little is said about these aspects in the Draft Plan is beyond this commentator. If I was a young member of the community, I would be looking at this Plan for some assurances about the future

Training and Employment Housing availability relates quite closely to the need for training of younger people in lower cost units such as those to be found on St Michaels trading estate, some having been destroyed by a recent fire. Only with training can these people earn sufficient to begin to buy a dwelling. Apprentice schemes need to be established by which experienced and skilled workers in Bridport Area can pass on these skills to younger people who then stay in the Area and become the future management of local businesses. This is also all about how to create attractive work situations where young members of the Bridport Area community can be encouraged to stay in Bridport, not 'emigrate' into one of the housing estates for several thousands of people being established outside say Exeter. Quite why so little is said about these aspects in the Draft Plan is beyond this commentator. If I was a young member of the community, I would be looking at this Plan for some assurances about the future

I strongly support policy EE2 in relation to mixed use SMALL developments of housing and workshops. Bridport has demand for services and creative suppliers - food, arts, gardening services etc - brownfield sites are particularly suitable in my view and create a local economy and interest for residents rather than homogenous housing developments that in isolation add nothing to the local economy.
EE3 (d) Large scale development. Tourism must not destroy what attracts tourists.
Is there a conflict here with Policy H8?

the IMPERATIVE of maintaining and enhancing Bridport's Tourism. One may well ask, where is the discussion and argument that could guide members of the public to an understanding of this imperative and what actions would sustain such an objective. In its absence, Bridport Town economy could lapse into a very mediocre range of small activities that it would be hard to sustain. There would just not be sufficient 'mass of activity' to underpin the future. There has to be a wide diversity of work activity that adds to the Town Area's gross product as measured in £'s as well as the produce itself. This has to be centred on more than just the traditional Rope-making and Net-making industries if the Town is to survive as an independent source of earnings on a higher scale than the average for the lowest quartile of earners, with say £14,500 pa

"and encourage visitors to travel by sustainable means" This is not London with buses, dial a ride, underground, tube, over rail and river buses. This is WEST DORSET! Puffins on Portland are easier to see than a bus in the evening - and as for the weekends or winder - "sustainable means" would be hitch hiking.

92697084 EE2

92697085 EE3

93629098 EE2

90026786 EE3
Bradpole PC EE3

92697084 EE3

93865940 EE3 - d)

93820756	EE2 b) and c)	<p>. Development proposals for a mix of housing and workshops/employment need to be mutually compatible, with considerations such as noise and traffic being taken into account. I don't see why residential developments should have to have studios/workshops in them. what about possible noise, deliveries, mess etc. Living near to business areas is not necessarily nice at all - look at St Andrews Gardens and the noise and smells form business there.</p>
93901051	EE	<p>the requirement for existing employment or premises to be shown to be unviable and that there should be an appropriate alternative is unreasonable as for example non viability can be a reason on its own. Replace 'and' in the 7th line with 'or'. The reference to the proposed employment land at Vearse Farm on page 43 in the preamble to the employment policies, being for B1(office) and B2 (office and light industrial) is incorrect. B1 and B2 are the correct definitions for both office and industrial employment uses. Delete within the bracket for B2 'office and light'.</p>
Sym Estate	EE1	<p>You will be aware that local people think that over tourism has destroyed their town and surrounding during summer and that so many accidents on A35 are due to this.</p>
93895439	EE	<p>Many if not most of the proposals could result in the opposite of what elsewhere it is hoped to achieve i.e. to spoil the physical attraction of Bridport and the semi-rural lives of its inhabitants!</p>
93884001	EE	<p>Tourism will continue to be an important economic driver for Bridport. The reason that this part of West Dorset is so popular is the beautiful countryside, maritime landscape and rich architectural and cultural heritage of Bridport Town. The best way to maintain the Bridport area as a popular tourist destination will be to protect the things that make Bridport special. This includes its vibrant arts and music scene, its historic buildings and architecture and its rural setting – Bridport town is one of the few places in the UK where you can see beautiful countryside at any point in the town centre.</p>
93881104		
93802365	EE	<p>If there is demand for employment space why are St Michael's Trading Estate plans allowing 25% less commercial space? developments for tourism must not impact on the lives of local people.</p>
93802365	EE3	<p>The requirement at part b) is unevidenced and unjustified and is not in conformity with the adopted Local Plan. Part b) does not provide clear and evidenced guidance on when studios and workshops will be sought and what proportion of the overall scheme they should comprise or the mix between studios and workshops.</p>
	EE2	<p>We consider that Policy EE1 should include a requirement that any proposals for residential development should be compatible with existing business uses. This would help avoid complaints by occupants of new residential developments against established businesses, for example about noise, loss of amenity, anti-social working hours, etc.</p>
BTC	EE1	<p>We suggest consideration of the term “appropriate homeworking” at Policy EE2, rather than simply “homeworking”. We consider that this may help guard against conflict between business and residential uses. This could also be reflected in Policies EE2(c)(2) and EE2(c)(3).</p>
BTC	EE2	
		<p>The requirement in Policy EE3(c) for signposting is supported, but the Town Council would like to see this signage co-ordinated in terms of design, locations, etc., and not left to individual organisations/developers to interpret the requirements.</p>
BTC	EE3	
		<p>Policy EE3(d) would benefit from a definition of the term “large-scale tourism development”, for objective scrutiny of proposals.</p>
BTC	EE3 d	

Policy CF

response from Text error	Factual error	Policy reference	Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
90306539		CF			More wide us of the Children's Centre and Youth Centre. Re-in statement of Chancery House or similar. More focus on Leisure Centre nb - Swimming pool.			
90755525		CF			Bridport Leisure Centre needs support to maintain full facilities, including swimming pool.			
90828803		CF			Would these be centred around an existing medical centre? with the case of community infrastructure? New services of many kinds should be encouraged and facilitates. With more traffic on main roads and an increasing ageing population. There will be an increasing need for facilities and services to be local to avoid travelling to Dorchester/Lyme Regis. Its a thought.			
93529939		CF			Throughout the country leisure facilities are declining, not because people do not use them but because they are underfunded and expensive to run. Why should it be any different here? Everywhere in this Plan you are seeking support for funding. You are unlikely to get it because the people in West Dorset generally do not have the resources to contribute. There is no money tree,			
93452747		CF			New community infrastructure is needed to keep pace with housing growth.			
93440723		CF			Bridport Leisure Centre is extremely important to all sectors of the community and it is essential that this be supported with appropriate funding.			
93309179		CF			We are lucky to have an excellent Leisure Centre that is well used. With expansion of the town and surrounding areas that is inevitable, the facilities at the Leisure Centre will become inadequate. West Dorset District Council (WDDC) have indicated, in the past, that funding is not guaranteed. The Leisure Centre is vital to maintaining the health and wellbeing of the local population and must be retained in perpetuity. WDDC and in the future the Unitary Authority for Dorset must ensure that the future of the Centre is guaranteed along with expansion of the facilities and the introduction of other local facilities like open air gym machines such as in the Great Field in Poundbury and more play areas like the one in West Bay/			
93296195		CF			This recognises the importance of community facilities, and reflects the need for people to use them if they want to retain them. Hopefully this will generate new and innovative provisions around the area.			
92697084		CF			s the population of Bridport Area grows towards 18,000, a major review will be needed of all infrastructure communications, and services used by private householders, businesses, institutions and charities. The 'headlong push' for more houses, even if 1,000 people were on the housing list and were re-housed, means that a large proportion of additional houses due to be constructed are likely to become targets for investment or holiday homes. This suggests that the perceived 'Housing Need' in Bridport is well over-stated. Apart from the proposed scheme "Watton Village", little provision has been seen in any of the WDDC Planning Committee's decisions in the last four years for dwellings that local people needing one can afford.			
92586471		CF			Bridport needs the Leisure Centre; it is vital for health and social welfare. Community facilities are best served in multi-use buildings, which saves money. We need strategies to encourage pride in our community and which encourage more people - young and old to engage in it.			
92382072		CF			Existing community infrastructures are heling to save money in other quarters e.g. NHS. We must not lose any community spaces especially the Leisure Centre which is very well used and key to community activity and health.			
92358695		CF			Ensure that outdoor play areas are not accessible to dogs.			
92288839		CF			The Leisure Centre is, along with the Arts Centre, a jewel in the crown of our town.			
92140378		CF			We must support it in its endeavours to continue to provide excellent facilities for all residents and visitors.			
91970522		CF			Support for the swimming pool essential for children's safety.			
93648460		CF			I have objected because the current facilities needs to be improved not just maintained			
93644582		CF			The Leisure and Community facilities in Bridport are great and need to be protected. As more housing is built the facilities must be increased to serve the extra population. Already it is very hard to find premises at an affordable rate as demonstrated by the community shed and scrap store which are hunting for premises.			
90020760		CF1			Indoor skate park - really? Revitalisation of meetings groups activities for young are much needed			
93084039		CF1			CF1: too Draconian. Sounds like something from Stalinist Soviet Union.			
93865940		CF 2b)			Why does CF1 have a paragraph (d) on retail? Seems out of place in this section. do not know what "improved utility infrastructure" means			
93799196		CF1 - point b/d			Should be 'not allowed' rather than just 'resisted' point d) - this section is not about retail?			
94044543		CF			The maintenance of the swimming pool at the leisure centre is essential for the safe water training of people particularly the young people in a seaside area.			
93901051					the leisure centre is a very valuable resource but also other leisure facilities, clubs etc.			
93881104					Bridport Leisure Centre supports the whole community with a huge range of sporting, recreational, health and wellbeing activities. It also provides rehabilitation programmes for people recovering from serious conditions including cancer. It is an extremely important resource for the whole of Bridport and its parishes and deserves continued public funding to ensure that it can continue providing this huge range of activities.			
93734143					The Bridport Leisure Centre is an excellent facility and is widely used by both all age groups within the community and visitors as well. Public funding should be used to ensure it's continuity and development (including the swimming pool).			
93773781					Any planned expansion of local housing and business provision must be adequately matched by proportional increases in well-funded local services e.g. medical services, transport, education etc.			

		<p>The Town Council supports the submission made by the Bridport and District Allotments Society, which calls for the inclusion of allotments in the Community Facilities section of the plan, so that these can be covered by Policy CF1.</p>
BTC	CF1	
BTC	CF1 d	<p>does not appear to have a clear relationship with community facilities. It may be that the wording needs to be changed, or that this clause should be included within the Economy and Employment policies would benefit from the inclusion of a forward vision for community facilities. This would enable a more objective judgement of identified need, against which development proposals can be judged</p>
BTC	CF2	<p>The Town Council asks whether consideration should be given within the Plan to providing a definition of 'community facilities'</p>
BTC	CF	<p>Proposed additional paras: Allotments are not mentioned in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, and we propose the following additional text for the Community Facilities chapter, page 39, to follow the section on Outdoor Play Areas. Allotments would thus be covered by Policy CF1 on the following page. This proposed addition has the support of the committee of the Bridport and District Allotments Society and Bridport Town Council's Plans Committee.</p> <p>Allotments</p> <p>The popularity of allotment gardening is an important feature of Bridport's commitment to the production and promotion of local food. The Neighbourhood Plan area contains more than 200 allotments, most of them provided by the town and parish councils, and there are about 80 local residents on waiting lists. There has been a significant increase in the number of plots in response to growing demand over the past 20 years, during which time the councils have worked closely with the Bridport and District Allotments Society (formed in 1998), which has 185 members.</p> <p>Allotments provide local people of all ages with the opportunity to grow their own food and to enjoy the exercise and social intercourse which are part of the activity all year round. As such they make a significant contribution to the promotion of healthier lifestyles and to the improvement of physical and mental wellbeing. The allotment sites in the Neighbourhood Plan area also form an integral part of Bridport's green infrastructure network, making an important contribution to biodiversity and to preserving the historic character of the Plan area. Existing allotment sites in the Neighbourhood Plan area will be protected, and opportunities should be sought to provide additional allotments in response to demand, where suitable sites can be identified.</p>
C.Wild for Allotment Assoc C.Wild for Allotment Assoc		
c.Wild for Allotment Assoc		
c.Wild for Allotment Assoc		

Policy LH

response from	Text error	Factual error	Policy reference	Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
89717956			LH			LH1 but I would like to see an emphasis on using brownfield sites for affordable homes development (e.g. Mountfield site, Fishermans Arms etc.?); isn't this a Govt ambition? LH4 What are the "very special circumstances in a)? Isn't Colmers Hill (your logo?) to be protected? If it's outside the area why is it a logo?			LH1: Verse Farm will put the kibosh on this one from the get go so you might as well forget it LH2: see LH1 comment. LH3: a great and practical proposal (at last). LH4: ditto. Ensure there is no "creep" into these areas.
90020760			LH						
90306539			LH						
90755525			LH			Bridport is lucky to have so many open access hills surrounding the town. Need to ensure developments do not encroach including roads as well as housing. These spaces need finance to maintain. Essential. This is special and must be protected - it does support wildlife and is precious to those of us lucky to live close by. The problem with gulls may have to need attention - not quite sure how.			
90828803			LH						
91175990			LH			would like the areas of SSSI and SNCI to be mentioned in the plan. That the area between the river Brit adn West Bay Road be added to the policies LH2 LH3 adn LH4			
90828803			LH			Essential. This is special and must be protected - it does support wildlife and is precious to those of us lucky to live close by. The problem with gulls may have to need attention - not quite sure how.			
91644627			LH			We can't have enough green. All council planting should be done with wild flowers.			
91576275			LH			Not sure that the green gaps are that important. If additional houses are to be provided, then some sacrifice of the space in these gaps may need to be made.			
Bradpole PC			LH			Appears to be mostly landscape & little heritage No reference to utilising brownfield to protect the AONB landscape as described in the 2017 Housing White Paper.			
						This is a no brainer. But I have a long memory and I was also on the Council that debated the last Local Area Plan in the 1980s. Back then we stated that no building works should take place above the eyeline, i.e on hills. Then they passed the plans for West Mead and others which totally ignored that directive. This will be no different now. Unfortunately we in Bridport have learned that it does not matter how much you debate or consult with us residents, you will ultimately do what you want. As long as the developers have the money you will grant the permission and to hell with public opinion. We have learned that from Vearse Farm. This is a disaster in the making. There is no sufficient infrastructure in place, the medical services cannot cope with the 18,000 + patients they have now and there is insufficient public transport. Most people will work out of the area and therefore the cars used will be much more than at present. In the holiday season, it will be pure chaos.			
			LH			Whilst recognising that the Vearse Farm development is needed, it is essential that it conforms to this policy. In particular, the development must not detract from the skyline - wherever it is viewed from. You state that "developments which adversely affect the visible quality of the local landscape will not be supported"; Vearse Farm must comply with this.			
93497005			LH			Strongly support green gaps			
93452747			LH			Ensure that new developments ie Vearse Farm comply with these objectives			
93544547			LH						
93436970			LH			Where possible new tree planting should of edible varieties ie. fruit or nut which would benefit the community and the wildlife.			
						We are still confused with regard to the definition of Green Gaps and Green Spaces. Our council approves the vision of differentiating between the communities, but sustainable development must not be ruled out completely. The use of a LVIA could well assist in this. Bridport is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the only UNESCO World Heritage site in England. We have diverse flora and fauna that must be protected and retained. The balance of open land, wooded hillsides and mixed buildings makes the environment a place that people want to live and enjoy. It is important that any development is controlled in such a way that the environment is protected by maintaining the current green spaces as they are for everyone to enjoy.			
Symondsburry PC			LH						
93309179			LH						

93296195	LH	<p>Whilst development is necessary, the affect of green spaces, natural areas and particularly quiet areas on the mental and physical health of the community cannot be over emphasised. Because the affect of the loss of these areas is not immediately noticeable, their necessity is often under estimated.</p> <p>es, protect West Dorset's unrivalled landscapes. But, doing so is made far more risky and impractical by Ministers in government ordering 'directives' to be addressed at Local Authorities to 'push-through' housing plans. So, for the time being, applications submitted to Local Authority Planning Committees to develop land for housing cannot be adequately assessed by the public at extremely short notice. Almost no period of Notice to the public effectively removes the 'democratic right' to be consulted and to respond. This is a travesty! It means that any sensible progressive development cannot be subjected to the norms of Planning legislation hitherto applied, leading one way only to a disorganised concrete jungle. Once concrete is laid, it is very difficult to have it removed</p> <p>As with point 10, include strategies to involve young people in understanding the value of local wildlife and green spaces (links with engaging with the anti-litter message too).</p> <p>It would be a shame if the now separate villages coalesced into one large town.</p>
92697084	LH	
92586471	LH	
92288839	LH	
92140378	LH	<p>hat about allotments? Not mentioned, very important 70+ on waiting list. Very important to retain green corridors and smaller spaces there is a tendency to infill and build on any space. Bio diversity is very important. There should be a clause that any survey is undertaken at an appropriate time - spring, summer not in the depths of winter when everything is hibernating. There seems to be no monitoring of sites and local knowledge is ignored. Relocation is not an answer, it leads to loss and dispersal. Bothenhampton has a high incidence of slow worms which are never taken into account. Has policy LH1 got teeth!? Can it be enforced? LH4A - what are the specific circumstances we've never been told what they are for Vearse Farm!</p>
93648460	LH	<p>The conservation of the skyline and views of green hills need not compete with housing if the planners were more open to unusual ideas such as building into the hill and using growing roofs. Keeping the quality of biodiversity and green corridors for wildlife not only helps the ecosystem but improves the environment for us all. The pressure for people to make profits must be balanced against the future for the population and the earth.</p>
93243956	LH	<p>Please add the field adjacent to Happy Island Way, Jessopp Avenue and the River Asker to protected green space H, and/or add the whole area bounded by Lee Lane and the River Asker and Jessopp Ave/ Happy Island Way as a further anti-coalescence area E. As in the Local Area Plan.</p>
93137524	LH	<p>Policy LH1 Clause a)1. is absolutely vital in my opinion Policy LH2 Clauses a) & b) are absolutely vital in my opinion Policy LH3 Clause a) is absolutely vital in my opinion, so my objection is that, despite what I understood was an affirmation by the council following the recent (and previous) consultation(s) concerning the Local Plan Development Area, the 'Green Gap' area in Bradpole adjacent to Local Green Space H and enclosed by the River Asker, Lee Lane, Jessopp Avenue and Happy Island Way, has not been designated as an Anti-Coalescence Area, as it should have been. This needs to be rectified. Policy LH4 Clauses b), c) & e) are absolutely vital in my opinion</p> <p>All very nice and difficult to disagree with> But the amount of green spaces and AONB will reduce. The plan on many pages mentions protecting the AONB etc. But the acceptance is that with VF and other developments the AONB will shrink. It would be far more honest and transparent for the policy just to say that: given the needs for growth and the need to meet government housing targets we will build on the AONB, but aim to leave 50% of the AONB landscape around Bridport untouched. The rest which will be build on we aim to plant trees and have some grass to make it look a little nicer.</p>
93092785	LH	
93084039	LH	<p>Support all of these, but especially the Green Gaps policy. So important to stop development sprawl and all the settlements just joining up. We don't appreciate what we've got and any new development must be very carefully located.</p>

			Essential to protect all of these areas especially as the Govt equates AONB landscape to that of National Parks. It is why many come to visit and live in our area thus adding to the local economy. Local surveys have always shown that preservation and protection of the landscape is of the highest priority and this is reflected in the various vision statements. In line with Govt guidance brownfield sites should be fully exploited for housing before any AONB land is surrendered. The hills and skylines give Bridport its character, so anything that has an adverse impact must be avoided.
93018770	LH		
93267771	LH1		
			strongly support this policy the landscape surrounding Bridport is unique the hills and valleys add to residents and visitors enjoyment and amenity of the area, an area of outstanding natural beauty. Developments which are visually prominent and or visually detract from the area by encroaching on valuable green space must be avoided as they will destroy the landscape value of the area both in terms of it's intrinsic and recreational value to residents and the economic value that it creates due to the attractiveness of the area to tourists. Very small scale developments which blend with the local design guidelines and building style using traditional materials are the only way to avoid encroachment and blight the visual appearance of the area which is an essential component of Bridport's uniqueness and supports its economy. Development needs to be low rise so that hills and skyline are not obscured. what happens to an LVIA? How is it judged and what are the criteria for a development being permitted or refused?
93629098	LH1		
93640180	LH1		
91139069	LH1c		
			I strongly support this policy particularly in relation to biodiversity net gain - this is an absolute must to ensure that habitats and the wildlife that reside or visit these habitats are managed for future generations.
93629098	LH2		
			LH2 - wildlife needs (LH3) green gaps and corridors to thrive. The odd pocket simply isn't good enough. LH3 and Bridport and its neighbouring parishes must have clear green boundaries to avoid suburbanisation and merging. Comments apply to LH4 as well.
93267771	LH2/3/4		
91139069	LH3		LH3(a) and LH3(b) at first reading appear to be saying the same thing, in different words. The difference is so subtle that it should be re-worded into one statement
			is strongly supported. In other parts of the UK urban sprawl has led to the total loss of historic communities which had made them unique and valued by their residents. Retaining a sense of local pride in your own distinct community is essential rather than living in an urban mass that has lost its identity. Absolutely vital.
93440723	LH3		
93700192	LH3		
			I strongly support this policy. The retention of green barriers between the outlying parishes is essential to retain the character of the villages and of the area in general. These areas are also important wildlife corridors and support the biodiversity of the area. Without these green barriers coalescence and urban sprawl ensues, this has been evidenced across the UK and detracts from the amenity of the area to it's existing residents and will impact negatively on the economy as the area becomes less attractive to visitors. Coalescence must not be allowed to happen, in my view small scale developments with associated workshops of no more than 8 houses units are the only solution to both housing need and the encouragement of small business enterprises in the area. Green gaps are too small.
93629098	LH3		
93640180	LH3		
			I would suggest this area between West Bay road and the river Brit is a vital green space, adding to the visual charm of West Bay, situated in the AONB and an important anti coalescent area to be protected in future at least for 10 months of the year. Otherwise, the landlord is likely to try to extend the camping season further and put permanent buildings on the site without planning permission as he has done in the past
91175990	LH4		
			I don't see how "seeking new corridors" is compatible with the purpose of a Neighbourhood Plan, which is there to guide development rather than carry it out.
91139069	LH4		
			(a)What are "Special Circumstances"? (d) define "good quality outdoor space". Could the 6-acre standard be included?
Bradpole PC	LH4		
93700192	LH4		New houses should have more than the usual 'token' gardens.

93629098	LH4	these are important landscape features some of which are protected and must remain so. They support biodiversity, a wide range of wildlife some including protected species have a long heriate and to could be considered as assets of community value. Development on these sites must be resisted at all costs.
coft	pg 43	- Is the concurrent repetition of text referring to "at least four hectares of land..." deliberate? Page 43 - according to http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/1987/764/schedule/made/class B2 is more usually referred to as "General Industrial - Use for the carrying on of an industrial process other than one falling within class B1 above or within classes B3 to B7" and we would agree this, rather than purely B1 (Business), is a preference for local businesses.
coft	pg 43	Keep the parishes with their individual identities.
93865940	LH	For the Local Green Spaces (reasons for designation) table, Borough Gardens does have wildlife value, e.g. resident hedgehogs and diverse bird and insect life.
93820756	LH4	should be 'will not be allowed'
93799196	LH1 b)	no building in these areas should be allowed at all
93799196	LH3/4	What is the criteria for agreed space? The area at Orchard Crescent has not been marked.
	LH4	
94044150		The green areas and hills around Bridport are extremely important both for the environment, for the health of residents, for wildlife and to maintain the unique beauty of our town. To preserve just the top of Watton Hill for example would cut off the natural habitat of the wild deer population, badgers, foxes and birds. Therefore if building were to take place it should be restricted to the lower more level section along the road.
		It is essential that attempts by developers at coalescence are stopped, They would destroy the diversity of the communities. All hill sides and plateaus should not be developed at all. I refer particularly to repeated attempts to develop north of Watford Lane Bradpole in spite of two planning enquiries turning it down. And to attempts to develop the Asker and Brit Valley sides. They would destroy the rural character of the town and villages. None of these areas have been shown in the map on page 51. This is a serious omission. The Asker valley sides have been the subject attempts to extend the area of the Jessop estate they have been traditionally used by generations as recreational areas most particularly east of Happy Island Bridge referred to in the attachment as H+. This area should be incorporated in H. The southern edge of H should be extended to the road Jessop avenue.
94044543	LH	
93901051	LH	you need to put in anti spread measures too - the town should not be expanding outwards at all - our town boundaries are fine where they are, no encroachment into the surrounding countryside
		add the word significantly in the first line after 'Development that' c) replace 'may be' in the first and second lines with 'is' Policies LH3 and LH4 are dealt in separate representations submitted on behalf of Symondsbury Farms and the Watton Trust. These representations are endorsed in respect of Symondsbury Estates.
Sym estate	LH1	when selecting land for building houses the existing corridors for wildlife should be protected.
93891367	LH2	
		Trees help to cloth the landscape, provide partitions between housing and non housing areas, (not forgetting partitioning between different housing estates). It could be said that trees will hide the fact that an area has been "built up" not everyone is a natural "townie" and Bridport attracts many countryside lovers.
93891367	LH1,3,4	I support these policies 100%, particularly the protection of the surrounding hills and skylines.
93884001		

Rep Watton
Hill Trust

LH3 pg 49

identifies a series of Green Gaps which are described as being to "avoid coalescence between the settlements of Pymore, Allington, Bradpole....." A map on page 51 shows the areas to be designated as Green Gaps. Area B is described as being the Bradpole & Pymore Green Gap. Pymore is not a settlement but the redevelopment of a former brown field industrial site for residential purposes. It contains no services and looks to Bradpole for the provision of shops schools etc The area is, of course, already covered by policies which protect the area from unjustified development (e.g. AONB, flood restrictions). Area B as drawn would restrict the development area proposed as part of the consultation into the Joint Local Plan Review, a matter which is still to be resolved as the District Council's original objections are considered to be capable of being overcome. If that is the case then the substantial benefits of this development in the form of Affordable housing, open space provision would be potential lost. I attach a plan showing what would represent a more appropriate area to prevent the coalescence of Pymore, Allington and Bradpole without prejudicing the potential future development, with its attendant benefits, of the land to the north and west of Watton Hill.

The use of Pymore Road as the eastern boundary represents a logical and easily defended boundary to the Green Gap. Policy LH4 seeks to designate areas described as local green spaces which it will protect from built development except in very special circumstances. Local Green Space S (Watton Hill) is a site in private ownership and is not therefore currently available to the public as a local green space. It forms part of an agricultural holding. As matters stand it has no reasonable prospect of it being brought into use for the benefit of the public. Its protection from unacceptable development is already safeguarded by the policies protecting the AONB. The designation of this area as a local green space should be deleted.

The policies for landscape and heritage are probably the most important to protect the facts that make this area so special to live, work and for tourists to continue coming back . The anti-coalescence measures are essential to prevent the communities of Symondsburry, Bradpole, Walditch, Bothenhampton and Pymore becoming joined up 'suburbs' of Bridport town. This would cause these communities to lose their unique identities and for Bridport to become another urban mass which as previously state I have experiences as a local councillor. The green gaps (and green spaces) are vital in retaining the unique nature of this area and there should be no policies that allow development in these areas.

Policies B and C are directly converse to one another. Where you say developments that affect landscape will not be supported, followed directly by a statement that says "where development adversely affects landscape"...so which is it?

Spaces of LH4 and 'B' of LH3 - why does the space/s not extend down to the existing houses on the eastern side? It leaves it open to development. The Watton village idea is in direct conflict. Green spaces and access to them are fundamental to the nature of Bridport.

Keep space around Bridport. No encroachment between Bradpole and Bridport.

LH1 - is there not a slight inconsistency between b) and c)? To answer my question, I assume the decision is b) will be based on consideration of an LVIA. Who decides if an LVIA is required? Bridport like most places suffers from large amounts of litter in some areas, should there not be specific references to the need for a blitz on litter and some form of public education on the anti-social nature of litter?

Totally agree with this policy and the comments in the introduction. The distinctive landscape around Bridport, the green corridors between and within parishes, should have significant protection to resist urban sprawl. Areas marked as green gap and green spaces should not allow new developments under under any circumstances. The same applies to the protection of our hills and skylines. There are plenty of areas within Bridport, such as Flood Lane, that have been derelict for many years, that should be considered instead.

There is a slight anomaly between the anti-coalescence measures (green gaps) to keep separate communities having a 'sense of place' whilst at the same time encouraging the community to think and feel as a whole. It is a careful balance, of course.

93881104

93802365

LH1

93795622

LH4/3

93784246

93782324

LH1

93734143

LH1

93723011

93732666	LH4	<p>Asker Meadows. In may of this year I stood and admired the meadows from the footpath from New Zealand Farm to Morrisons. The cattle were grazing the lush green grass and buttercups, it was a lovely site. The the Town Councils Japanese Tractor/Flail mulched the lot ready for the noisy/money making season! Twice during the summer the meadow was used for camping/car parking, I thought it had been agreed this would not happen? The field at present is littered with cable ties and other rubbish! How does this tally with LH2? The people who live in this area already have to endure to noise/pollution from the A35 trunk road. (Bridport is clearly not by-passed) They now have to endure noise from what is supposed to be a nature reserve. Dumping Christmas trees in the hedge also seems an odd move to me! Isn't that fly tipping? Pg 53 - LH4 Asker Meadows beauty - history - recreation - tranquillity - wildlife! Please add re field adjacent to Happy Island Way, Jessop Avenue, River Asker - to protect green spaces. Pg 53. Plus the area bounded by Lee Lane, River Asker, Jessop Avenue, Happy Island Way including over E, ref 'NPP document' Please refer and letter/schedule 25-3-2015 appeal P Douglas Baldwin 20,Jessop Avenue. DCC ref PSC/E0079/VGAP1/2014</p> <p>While I would not object to a small (provided it is for local people or have moved into the area for work reasons) amount of new homes in Walditch, it is essential 'old' Walditch remains a distinct village and the space between the village retained and protected.</p> <p>Avoid building on site between main road and Walditch on left as coming into Bridport</p> <p>The green spaces around Bridport are a key part of living here, especially the field next to Happy Island . Protecting them is very important.</p> <p>Would like to see Asker Meadows enhanced as a visitor friendly nature reserve in keeping with its LNR status</p> <p>We are therefore asking that the field marked H+ on the Local Green Spaces Plan be added to H. (Doc 10) Or, alternatively, or in addition, we are asking for the area marked E on the Anti-Coalescence Map (Doc 11) be added as an additional area.</p> <p>whilst we welcome the approach of the neighbourhood plan in recognising the importance of good design and housing provision in Bridport, we object to policy LH4 on local green spaces as it currently stands.</p>
94046016	LH4	
KCERA		
KCERA		
KCERA		
KCERA		
KCERA		<p>NB EVIDENCE BASE PROVIDED</p>
Ross Jessop Letter		
BTC	LH1	<p>Our concern is with regards to the site marked on the plan as H and referred to as Happy Island Way. As I explained we are the owners of a part of this site which is allocated in the West Dorset local plan under policy BRID 3 (land to the east of Bredy Vets Centre) to make provision for housing We are currently undertaking ecological studies on the site prior to submitting an application to ensure that development takes place in such a way as to encourage biodiversity and, where appropriate, provide habitat improvements. The proposal also includes a large amount of green open space along the river corridor. As I explained the approach that our development will take is not incompatible with the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan as it will provide a large amount of open space and a green corridor alongside the river. The land to be used for housing is not currently accessible to the public. However designating the land twice, once as housing in the Local Development Plan, and once as part of a green space in the Neighbourhood Plan, can only create confusion and ambiguity</p> <p>The Town Council is anxious to protect the traditional and iconic landscape views as seen from the urban area. We ask that Policy LH1 be amended to include a specific reference to such a requirement.</p>

Policy H

response from	Text error	Factual error	Policy reference	Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
89239711			H			<p>It would be really nice to see some self build developments and a greater proportion of social rented housing We urgently need an assessment of the number of empty residential properties in the town (ie above shops) and the potential for creating residential property in existing buildings within the town</p> <p>H1 Needs to have restrictions on future extensions to affordable houses as they can become unaffordable. H5 good to see restrictions on future ground rents etc H7 presumably this means on AONB land and should therefore be small developments with a maximum number of homes stipulated. H8 not sure if it is relevant to Bridport, second/holiday homes can benefit tourism. H9 as with H7 the developments need to be small scale and only allowed when all other options have been eliminated ~ brownfield sites etc. Would support with tighter restrictions to avoid speculative developers ruining our AONB.</p> <p>Back in the USSR</p>			
89717956 90020760			H H			<p>The percentage of affordable homes should be greater. The Threshold of ten should be reduced. The three year period should be extended to prevent further creeping development of market housing. Non financial viability should not be an valid reason for not complying with the rules.</p> <p>Much more secured tenancy for rented accommodation. More regulation of some private landlords. Ensuring the required number of affordable houses are built on each development.</p>			
90026786			H			<p>H8 - Yes, second homes? This may become a problem. Affordable housing that is affordable to the younger members of our community is No 1 priority. These must be energy efficient - suggest German/Scandinavian pre-sectioned housing, very quick to put up and arrives with double glazing installation expected and easily adapted to owners need. Co-Housing projects? Facilities for elderly folk to down size into rented and purchased. The issue of second homes inflates house prices and the issue of affordable homes for members of the community becomes an issue again.</p> <p>Insufficient strength – would-be developers always seem to find ways around the minimum affordable/social housing standards, usually claiming 'viability'. This is unacceptable.</p>			
90828803			H			<p>Affordable housing that is affordable to the younger members of our community is No 1 priority. These must be energy efficient - suggest German/Scandinavian pre-sectioned housing, very quick to put up and arrives with double glazing installation expected and easily adapted to owners need. Co-Housing projects? Facilities for elderly folk to down size into rented and purchased. The issue of second homes inflates house prices and the issue of affordable homes for members of the community becomes an issue again.</p>			
91181815			H			<p>We need to encourage more housing which buyers want. That includes 2nd homes, holiday homes and affordable homes. If there is a recession, and a policy of only principle residence there will be empty homes or more moving. Interference in the market under H8 & H9 could back fire. Why not encourage council homes or pre-fabricated homes which will solve housing needs but will have little impact on the community.</p>			
90828803			H			<p>What is affordable housing? It is many things to many different people because income varies from area to area. Lots of people here cannot afford to go this route because of their low incomes. You are also opening the door to ultra modern, ugly out of keeping housing if it states it is eco friendly. I have not yet seen a beautiful eco friendly building. There is too much emphasis on affordable and nothing on social housing. There is nowhere near enough social housing. While legally councils/housing authorities have to house single or unmarried mothers - usually girls who have barely left school and have not done a days work in their lives, then there will continue to be a social housing shortage.</p> <p>Also as an older resident of Bridport, I and many others do not want a housing complex with integrated age groups. When you get older you want peace and quiet and not live next to or near young families with children running around, yelling etc., as we have to put up with now.</p> <p>Policies H7 and H9 appear to be at odds with most other parts of the plan and should either be removed or radically re-thought.</p>			
93529939 93440723			H H			<p>In my view Vearse Farm does not meet the criteria set out in H5 and if the council is to adopt this Plan then developments of the size of Vearse Farm do not seem in line with the Plan's overall policies</p>			
93544547			H			<p>I agree to the plans of new housing being only for a Principal Residence this restriction should also continue in the covenant for the property if it is sold. (This already exists on some properties in West Bay.) I agree that there should be stricter enforcement of an element of social housing in a new development. To often the developers seem to be able to reduce the number claiming otherwise it is not affordable after they have agreed to the initial plans.</p>			
93436970			H						

93436970	H	<p>I am concerned about the level of new housing planned in West Dorset Districts plan and the effect of this on the local infrastructure..</p>
Symondsburry PC	H	<p>A hugely complex area which has been well covered and of course is very aspirational. H8 - this throws up several issues which we are not sure have been fully covered, and would be difficult to enforce.</p>
	H	<p>Bridport lacks genuinely affordable housing for those, particularly the younger generation, to buy or rent. The current government sees home ownership as the solution to address the housing crises current in the UK today. In Bridport home ownership is but a pipedream for many and this must be addressed. Affordability must be defined as linked to those earning less than the average wage locally and will almost certainly be rental property with secure tenancy not the short term leasehold favoured by many private landlords and Estate Agents. Developers must accept the risk that their profits may fall short of their projections when gaining outline planning permission for a large development eg Verse Farm. Planning approval should determine not just the number of homes to be built but the mix of homes with 35% affordable (for rent) by Bridportians. The development should be restricted to a mix of Studio, 1 and 2 bedroom flats along with 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses with no more than 10% being 4 bedroom detached.</p>
		<p>Once plans have been approved the developer must not be able to renege on the approved plans and must accept that they took a risk and will make a smaller profit than anticipated. Phased developments where additional land is annexed to a development that is completed or partially completed should always be treated as a single development with the overall number of homes used to determine how many affordable homes must be built. There should be no time limit to this restriction and should prevent greedy developers from building a larger development in tranches of 9 houses to avoid the provision of affordable housing and providing them with large profits. Any development must be built with providing homes for Bridportians although it must be recognised that some homes will be needed for incomers on the condition that the home is to be the primary residence. The building of second homes must be prevented because second home owners bring nothing to the area and, in more rural locations, can kill off a village.</p>
93296195	H	<p>Some innovative thinking has gone into this but I have little to no faith that it is achievable. As I have said previously developers are skilled in writing their applications to appear to conform but the reality is so often different and there appears to be little effective enforcement in place. There is an absolute minimum requirement for affordable, self-build or housing for locals. I recognise developers need an incentive to build but I feel this is weighted too heavily in their favour. As to proving there is a need for certain types of housing - realistically what developer is going to declare a need for rented homes, affordable etc - they do not generate enough money so we will just have more second home owners. Principle residency only applies to new houses therefore is limited in its effectiveness.</p>
93267771	H	<p>Would help to explain what "affordable housing actually means. H1, glad to see you've spotted that old chestnut, the developer's non-viability get out clause. Ditto the wheeze in H3. H5 - community consultation can be a bit of a tick-box exercise.</p>
93092785	H	<p>Positive policies on affordable housing etc. But could go further and include the likes of the Watton Hill eco project as the principle means of providing social/affordable housing. low cost and where the balance of majority affordable/social (ie 75%). The current 35% affordable is not good enough. The point re public/local council having access to viability reports by developers is positive. must include access during the planning proposal and also when at a later stage the developer claims can't afford the 35% affordable houses allocation. Make the developer sign up to this as part of the planning application so they can't hide behind commercial secrecy. also like the new houses limitation for second/holiday home sale.</p>
93018770	H	<p>Whilst I would support Community led housing on a small and proportionate scale this does not do it. If H7 a), refers to sites outside of the development boundary (i.e. AONB land) These must be strictly controlled in terms of numbers. As it stands development could take place in just one location to suit the needs of the whole area, that would be unacceptable. Similar concerns with H9. Whilst the preamble on p 55 draws attention to Local Plan policy H052 this is not reflected in the policy wording of H9 and it is the policy wording that counts. A developer could exploit this loophole and that would be unacceptable. I presume this is why the Local Plan places tight restrictions as it should do to protect exploitation of AONB. The Neighbourhood Plan should do likewise and it is a concern that it does not.</p>

92697084	H	<p>Housing Need and Affordability Housing Need A number of residents have expressed concern that the Housing Need figures presented to Local Authorities as an unarguable demand by national government are 'skewed', over-stated and inappropriate. Yet it seems that such figures are laid down as expectations that must be delivered by Local Authorities, failure to deliver leading to threats and imposition of irrelevant directions by national government. Local Authorities are therefore reacting by 'pushing through' decisions about housing developments as though each is a requirement, without adequate recognition of comments by members of the public and relevant response. Nothing is said in the Plan about this prospect. How can the Neighbourhood Plan be considered from a practical standpoint by local residents when expressing their views on the Plan? Affordability of Housing More emphasis is needed in the Draft Plan on the link between employment of local younger people, rates of income, and how these relate to the cost of obtaining local housing. Affordable and low-cost housing is what is needed, not yet more houses added to the private sector, priced too high for local younger people either to buy or rent, only to be mopped up by people outside Dorset as second or even third houses. Bridport should not be developed as though an investment opportunity for absentee landlords. That would be totally inappropriate to the needs of local people.</p> <p>The plan includes a "get-out" clause for developers (p58) where it states 35% "or less" affordable housing. Developers seek profit and always go for "less" if the plan allows - another reason why there is always insufficient parking in any new development. The vision is great - but will developers develop properties under these conditions or will they just go somewhere else?</p> <p>Nothing is affordable for the young. There is a need for social housing. Second homes need more control, together with holiday lets they are undermining the viability of some villages. For any new development the amenities need to be completed at the same time not afterwards so there is a time lag.</p> <p>There is not enough detail about these schemes to properly decide. I feel there will always be loopholes that allow developers to avoid the building of affordable housing and this is a real concern</p> <p>If all of the empty homes, second homes, holiday homes and buy-to-let homes, as well as the potential resident accommodation above shops could be 'freed up' we would not need new-builds.</p> <p>I believe these policies will help towards housing those in most need. It's unfortunate that government policies do not allow the Neighbourhood Plan to go further.</p> <p>In the housing sector there should be a look at where care homes and retirement homes can be fitted in near enough to the Centre so that residents can access the commercial quarter of the town easily.</p> <p>How enforceable is the 35% affordable housing threshold? Will the council have the resources to challenge a developer who reneges on the initial plan?</p> <p>15% social housing should be the maximum in any development - see my comments on H4 H4 is particularly important to avoid social homogeny e.g. all social housing, all retirement homes, all private ownership. This should go further and include provision for workshops and other facilities for 'micro economic development'</p> <p>Basic objections are for developers not to be given any planning permission if they are not prepared to commit to 100% affordability. This will scare off the get rich quick companies and allow local house builders with sensible plans to build for local residents. This will also bring the local house prices down in general and stop Bridport becoming a dormitory town for Yeovil and Exeter etc.with increasing suburbanisation around the periphery. Even if the 35% level is maintained this would be better (with NO EXCEPTIONS) - why give speculative builders profits to the detriment of the current residents? Lack of facilities, infrastructure and excessive traffic all fall to the local residents and councils while developers grab the money and move on. Don't let this happen just because the building land is cheap agricultural land and there is a promise of SOME affordable (really?) housing. In many instances at some stage in the process developers claim that profits are not what they were (due to inflation etc) and then renege or ask for affordable housing exceptions. Please STOP this in it's tracks. Houses without Jobs is a waste of time. Need to integrate development of employment as well as housing for those people</p> <p>three years until further applications allowed is not enough. Ten years. And in this area 35% affordable/social is too low a standard</p> <p>3 years to avoid affordable housing seems too short to me (5-7 years would be preferable)</p>
92586471	H	
92140378	H	
91970522	H	
93700192	H	
93648460	H	
89239711	H1	
93491094	H1	
93629098	H1	
89350775	H1,2,3,9	
91181815	H3	
93648460	H3	

93084039	H3/9	<p>H3 is good and needs to be applied to the Vearse Farm extension now proposed. H9 (b) looks odd. Surely somewhere rural like Allington should not have to take development for housing need from Bridport? I would not support that.</p> <p>Housing Mix & Balanced Community. Currently incomers overwhelmingly dominate the area's homebuyers' market. New builds not ring-fenced for local/affordable/social/starter needs should have a moratorium placed on them until such needs have been met. Then and only then should the stated balance re-apply. NB the definition of 'local' should be restricted to those who have lived in the district long-term, 7 years or more, with preference given to those with additional life-long family/generational connections.</p> <p>I would like to see all homes using lifetime standards and as many homes as possible built to wheelchair user standards.</p>
91181815	H4	
93648460	H4	
93629098	H4	<p>I largely agree to these policies but only on the basis that all developments should be small scale 8 units or less, should not be built on green spaces or corridors, fully accord with local design and build principles and accord with policy H4 i.e. are a mixture of homes should refer to the current Housing Needs Assessment as referred to in H7a)</p>
Bradpole PC	H4c)	<p>I am all for affordable housing for local people. H5 has wriggle room for developers.</p>
91644627	H5	<p>The principle is fine but the percentage is too high and should be 15% - see my response to H4</p>
93629098	H5	<p>For developments within DOB's. Note that the current Local Plan Review is proposing a new policy: HOUS8 Custom Build & Custom Build Housing and policy guidelines for such developments include those outside of DOB's on affordable Exception Sites in accordance with HOUS2. BPC supports this providing it is in line with HOUS2 as with ALL Exception Sites policies.</p>
Bradpole PC	H6	
93137524	H6	<p>Clause b) would be improved if it were minimum of 5% in developments of 20 or more Policy H6 Clause c) would be improved if it were minimum of three years (one year is no time at all to unprincipled developers) and it needs to be rigorously scrutinised throughout the sales period</p>
93648460	H6	<p>I welcome the inclusion of provision for self builders which could utilise and create employment for skilled local people. I would have preferred a 5% minimum services plots (Policy H6) as Teignbridge Council have demonstrated that it works well for them</p>
93629098	H6	<p>In general I agree but should be tightly controlled in terms of size, and design.</p>
91139069	H6c	<p>twelve months is too long and unfair on developers. Six months would be adequate</p>
93629098	H7	<p>This might be a potential loophole for unscrupulous developers to push through unsuitable development proposals using a Community Land Trust.</p>
Bradpole PC	H7 b)	<p>should refer to "unmet local demand" rather than "overall need". Condition for support: This policy needs to refer to "small-scale" sites where they are outside of DOB's (i.e. Exception Sites) and, as with H6 above, should accord with Local Plan Policy HOUS2.</p>
93440723	H7/9	<p>Policy H7 seems to provide an outlet for developers to disregard the Landscape and Heritage policies and could lead to large scale housing developments on the designated Green Gaps or Green Spaces. This could destroy the objectives of retaining the rural setting of Bridport and the individual characters of the town and its parishes. Policy H7 also appears to cut across the objective of providing socially balanced communities. It therefore appears to contradict many other policies and should be deleted from the Plan. Policy H9 again seems to cut across the objective to provide socially balanced communities.</p>
93267771	H7/9	<p>H7, this could be opening Pandora's box, so although community led housing may well be a good thing in theory, why should it trump perfectly good reasons for not permitting development on a site? And how big a development? H8, needs better evidence, which I'm sure can be found for impact of 2nd & holiday homes. In principal, I'd support this, but the evidence needs to be more robust to back this assertion, as you said in the introduction. H9 - same comment as for H7; and why should one parish have to meet the needs of a larger area? Bit like saying that Bridport should meet the needs of the whole of W Dorset. The Bridport Area is not compatible with tourist areas such as St Ives, Cornwall, and does not have the same level of associated housing problems. Lettable second and holiday homes contribute to the local tourism economy ref Policy EE3</p>
Bradpole PC	H8	<p>Perhaps this restriction could also be placed on new housing to prevent buy-to-let purchasers obtaining them. Prices of smaller properties might then become affordable.</p>
93700192	H8	<p>If policy H8 is not included in the final version, while other areas are protected, Bridport will become a magnet for second home owners wanting to buy in Dorset.</p>
93642825	H8	

91139069		H8e		What happens if a property owner defaults? What sanctions can be applied? I don't think this is a supportable or enforceable policy as it is written.
91181815		H9		just because more affordable/social homes are desirable is insufficient reason to skimp on other standards
				<p>H9 . This policy arose "after the event" (30 May joint meeting) and has not been agreed either by BPC or JCC. Exception sites are described generally as small-scale sites, with "small" being regarded as up to 10 dwellings. BPC have previously asked for the wording of 2015 Local Plan Hous2 (+ 2018review) to be used. This request was ignored and therefore this policy is unacceptable. n.b. The significant wording that appears in HOU52 (2015 & Review) states: - That the character, scale and design of the scheme is appropriate to the location; - That the proposal is capable of meeting an identified, current, local need within the town, local parish or group of (rural) parishes, which cannot otherwise be met; - That there are secure arrangements to ensure that the benefits of affordable housing will be enjoyed by subsequent as well as initial occupiers. This wording is not reflected in H9 and needs to be if BPC is to SUPPORT this policy. The local plan does allow Neighbourhood Plans to incorporate an exception sites cross subsidy policy but warns of the dangers of this because it: • would reduce the likelihood of 100% affordable housing sites being delivered; • could potentially increase land values; and • could result in significant unplanned growth for adjoining settlements. The BPC request to insert a condition limiting the proportion of market housing up to a max 25% has been addressed is SUPPORTED. An overall solution to H9 that can be SUPPORTED by BPC would be to re-write H9 in a precise and unambiguous way aligning it with HOU52 whilst taking the opportunity that HOU52 offers of introducing the cross subsidy clause subject to the agreed "up to a maximum of 25% open market housing" phased as currently stated. To be considered: Should permitted development rights be removed from "Affordable Housing" to ensure they remain affordable? Local Plan review doc 5:2.21 page 171 "The council may also remove permitted development rights to extend any affordable home ownership products on exception sites to ensure that they remain of a size that is likely to be affordable for subsequent occupiers." BPC supports this pragmatic approach to ensure homes remain "affordable".</p> <p>How does this tie in with LH1.3? Which would have greater weight in a planning application; would an affordable home Exception Site be permitted on a prominent hillside or to fill in between Bridport and, for example, Pymore?</p> <p>'Affordable' seems to mean very small in practice.</p> <p>Affordable housing proposals should be subject to the same planning permission rigours as any other development, expeditious treatment of such applications may lead to a lack of consideration to the detailed proposals and a poor quality, inappropriately located and designed development. Social housing should be limited to 15% of any development. It has been long proven housing developments that are largely composed of social housing create social deprivation and behavioural problems following policy H4 in this respect delivers mixed developments that avoid these problems.</p>
Bradpole PC		H9		
93491094		H9		
93700192		H9		
93629098	H9 d)	H9		
Colin Baker Bradpole PC		H9 d)	H9 d) to read: d) Where a proportion of open-market housing is required to help fund the development of such sites such proportion may not exceed a maximum of 25%* of the development total.	
91139069		H9d		<p>This is an apparently random figure. Where is the justification? The aim is fair enough.</p> <p>Does this mean that new homes will only be sold to people who are going to use it as their main home? If and when the Vearse Farm development takes place does this mean the developer can only sell to a buyer who will permanently live in the property? If so - this is going to be news to the developer.</p>
93865940		H8 - a)		<p>There appears to be a strong preference from the planners for retirement developments rather than affordable 1 and 2 bedroom flats for local young people. Surely this is the wrong policy as with no accommodation for younger people there will be no workforce to service the needs of all the old people moving into the expensive retirement blocks. The proportion of low cost, affordable housing on new developments should be 45%</p> <p>The 35% rule should be hard and fast, as it's not enough anyway.</p>
93851072		H		
93799196		H1		

		<p>it must apply to any future resale of the property. Similarly to H8, restrictions should apply to the purchasers of any affordable houses at least, but preferably to all new houses covered by this plan. They should be available to local residents only, defined by whatever is appropriate - being born here, resident status of more than 10 years etc. I believe such restrictions exist in other parts of Britain, eg Jersey. It is said we need more houses for our young but it is people moving from outside the area who buy these houses. Keeping them available to the locals only will keep the prices down. Any building at all should be restricted to brown sites and derelict areas. On the other hand, I don't see how Bridport could possible cope with any increase in traffic. Each new house will mean, on average, two cars. Even if they have their own parking spaces and access bypassing the town centre, they are bound to go through the old, narrow street like Victoria Grove, which are already almost impossible to navigate and very dangerous. Encouraging the residents with more foot and cycle paths is very good but in view of the aging population and shopping arranged around the use of cars, it's not going to make much difference to the traffic.</p> <p>Will the houses be affordable for the local average wage?</p>
93799196	H8	
93806877	H1	
93806877	H3	<p>This is encouraging 'greedy' developers to build a few units - move on to another area, then return to original site to build a few more.</p> <p>We will soon have an in balance of elderly persons luxury housing - usually bringing in retired people thus creating more need for health services etc.</p> <p>- Object - What's the difference between disused farm buildings etc being used for residential use i.e. Farm Employers/family members against holiday lets where they will be unoccupied for at least 50% of the year!</p> <p>I have read the plan and it very comprehensive only one query given the demographics in the future i.e. ageing population should it be included that new housing be built to Cat 2 (Part M dwelling) which incorporates low cost inclusive design principles when the dwelling is being built. It is a greater requirement than Cat 1 which is mandatory. Cat 2 and 3 have to be a planning requirement. This means if the occupants in the future require adaptations to remain living in their home these can be achieved without any structural amendment. The adaptation cost in these homes is usually significantly reduced therefore saving future costs of social care which given the current budgetary situation must make sense.</p> <p>I support the housing policies in general but feel that the number of houses proposed in some applications are excessive. any building plans must be very carefully considered from the point of view of the extra cars and traffic they will bring to an already congested town. i.e. where they are built.</p>
93806877	H4	
93806877	H8 F	
Jan Parker email		
94044150	H	
94044543	H	<p>The Council should adopt the same rules for planning that St Ives in Cornwall has. All new planning permissions should be subject to a covenant stating that they must be occupied or be resold at a valuation to some body such as a housing association. The discussions between the district valuer and the developer concerning funding public facilities and the trade off with affordable homes or social housing should be open to public scrutiny. Policy H0US2 should not be permitted where it has a major visual impact on the overall landscape.</p>
93901051	H8	<p>Defiantly support H8. too many homes are empty for too much of the year. There should be some form of principal residence or long term (non holiday) let requirement for all new homes. I know that holiday rentals bring in money to the area but they also have a negative impact on the availability of housing for locals and turn some villages into ghost towns in the winter. Holiday homes that are separate dwellings (ie could be sold outright or rented long term) should have a fee/local tax/ council tax supplement put on them, forcing the owner to contribute more to the local economy</p>
Sym estate	H1 b	<p>remove the reference to viability assessments being avail;able to the public. they can be scrutinised by independent consultants but it is unreasonable to expect applicants to reveal what could be confidential information. Replace the end of the criteria ' their claim shall be open to independent financial and technical scrutiny</p>
Sym estate	H2 c	<p>if the objective is to make housing development s 'tenure blind' in respect of affordable housing, it is not appropriate to show this in the site layout. It can be controlled by planning condition or legal agreement</p>
Sym estate	H3	<p>this blanket requirement in unreasonable as the level of affordable housing must be based on the individual circumstances in each case. This policy should be deleted as the point is covered in policy H1.</p>
Sym estate	H4 c	<p>the policy should be 'guided' by the housing needs assessment as conditions may vary from site to site</p>
Sym estate	H7 2	<p>it is unreasonable to require community led housing to be held in trust as a community asset in perpetuity. It should held in a form that ensures its retention for that use provided circumstances remain unchanged. this can be achieved by agreement. delete this criteria.</p>

92249247	H	<p>"in rural areas into housing is not permitted as the site is in an Area of Natural Beauty, such buildings may be converted to holiday homes " I do not understand this. If housing is not allowed under the AONB then how is a holiday let not housing? This is a nonsense. " where the residents spend most of their time when not working away from home." This is a massive loophole. PH9 in theory, but what is 'affordable housing'? Using 80% of the local rental prices around Bridport does not make it affordable housing for many people who are on minimum wage or zero hour contracts.</p> <p>In principle I support most of this section however, I would ask the question: how is it possible to build Retirement Properties for lower prices and do we need more anyway? Can smaller one and two bedroom flats for singles and couples with no children but below 55 yrs be built instead? That is an area of need in my opinion.</p> <p>We need smaller development as in Waddon Hill for local people not for second homes or holiday homes. Could have more control of big developers who want to make a quick buck they employ their own men usually as building workers - not local people. These builders know there is a loop hole in the law which they slip through and don't build as promised.</p> <p>We need the Waddon Hill development only this ticks all the boxes and would provide enough housing for local people. We do not need Vearse Farm which would encourage older non local people - no identity - the builders could not guarantee 'affordable homes' plus 1000 more cars on our roads that are jammed already.</p> <p>One can provide people with what you think they need and be disappointed with the results. Are car parks and garages needed? Garages are more commonly used as stores. In the case of garages separate from houses they are often used by tradesman as stores (they being from another part of town). Car parks with allocated spaces for different house owners are often only partly utilised as the car owners refer to park on the street outside their front door. (In some cases it is to prevent others parking in front of their houses.)</p> <p>Affordable MUST mean low cost/rent accommodation. We need masses of social housing for the present younger generation to live in and to acquire jobs in Bridport. We do not need any more people buying second homes here.</p> <p>Object to the requirement for viability assessments to be made public</p> <p>H1d- Starter homes should be included as affordable housing is at odds with the requirement in H2a if the objective is to make developments tenure blind.</p> <p>there needs to be a viability test attached to this policy as circumstances may dictate that affordable housing cannot be provided.</p> <p>Jadd 'over 10 units',</p> <p>guided' not 'based' line 3</p> <p>this is an impossible requirement and should be deleted. The Tenure can be controlled by planning conditions and legal agreements</p> <p>housing should reflect the style of the area - and not be imposed.</p> <p>Planning applications don't seem to work locally - design guides for any future development would be welcome</p> <p>In scale and proportion to the town's need i.e. small.</p> <p>Balanced, mixed communities which blend in with the existing community are the ones that are most successful. Most of the housing policies support this approach. However, policies H7 and H9 appear to contradict the other policies and also to be at odds with some other plan policies particularly those for landscape and heritage. Policy H7 states that housing 'may be permitted on sites where development would not otherwise be permitted' This could lead to developments on the designated green gaps or green spaces. Policies H7 and H9 should either be re-drafted to complement other policies or be deleted. There is little mention of priority being given to housing or derelict sites (such as the land adjacent to Flood Lane) – this should be prioritised over any developments on green land.</p> <p>Good thought and extensive consideration given to a difficult topic, especially in a region where wages are too low to sustain traditional concepts of 'affordable' housing. Excellent that the idea of 'balance' for the needs of the community is expressed and proactively supported.</p> <p>earse Farm development approved, yet fails to meet affordable housing targets?</p> <p>Avoid very large housing developments as detrimental to country aesthetic. Why would planning application be granted if affordable housing is not in the plan?</p>
92249247	H	
93896119	H	
93896119	H	
93891367	H	
93885380	H	
Rep Watton Hill Trust	H1b	
Rep Watton Hill Trust	H2c	
Rep Watton Hill Trust	H3	
Rep Watton Hill Trust	H4 a	
Rep Watton Hill Trust	H4 c	
Rep Watton Hill Trust	H7 2	
93881918	H5	
93881918	H9	
93881104	H7/9	
93865431	H	
93802365		
93802365	H3	

93802365	H4 a	There are already many retirement properties available! People with young family do not want to rent, they want a chance to buy a home - not shared equity either. Genuinely affordable. Homes for families are priority otherwise we will move away.
93802365	H5	Infrastructure must be invested in and appropriately supported by any new development. GPs etc.
93802365	H7	No building on green belt AONB.
93802365	H8	How will you govern this policy? FJ No! Why should a holiday home be allowed when a local person is not permitted planning permission?
93796919		Think more should be done to bring empty homes back into use.
93782324	H1	Can an application which proposes to provide less than 35% affordable housing not simply be refused?
93782324	H5	Developments above a certain threshold should include an assessment of the impact on public amenities and, if applicable, provision for the expansion of public amenities.
93773781		I would support the use of brownfield sites for new housing developments. I am wary of building on designated green sites, even eco developments, as this could open the way for a surge of building on areas which give Bridport its character.
93773781	H7	I think we need to be very specific about what 'affordable' housing is given levels of wages and employment locally. This needs to take into account aims to encourage younger people and new industries/employment opportunities into the area.
93773781	H8	I think there needs to be restrictions on selling new houses to people using these as second homes.
93723011	H8	particularly keen to implement Policy H8 - absolutely essential for community survival.
93732666	H8	Second homes should attract at least double council tax and all empty properties should be taken over by local authority or/and sold at auction at a discounted rate. Example 12, Valley Road, empty 10 years +! To local authority or housing authority etc not for profit! Need before greed. there is no excuse for leaving residential property empty at a time when so many people are desperate for a home (not an investment). Bridport has become little more than 'London on Sea' in recent years. This is not progress!
93730008		I don't think private developers should be required to finance all affordable housing, or to be responsible for supplying the needs of all parts of the community. Perhaps local authorities can find the money for some of the mix of housing required, after all, WDC found the money to build itself new offices. Requiring private developers to build a high proportion of affordable housing must, to some extent, contribute to rising house prices, for others - the money has to come from somewhere.
93727632	H1	make it essential that new developments provide a minimum 35% affordable housing.
93727632	H3	make it for all developers over 2 units to set a standard. H5 - provide self build plots more often.
93727632	H8	consider using redundant buildings for emergency local accommodation or social housing rather than tourism. No point providing over capacity B&B/SC if there are local homeless people being forced to live in Weymouth B&B's in emergency accommodation.
CG FRY	H5	It will not always be appropriate to provide this information at outline application stage; some of this information will be provided at reserved matters stage and some through the discharge of planning conditions or secured by S106 Agreement.
CG FRY	H6	The requirement for 4% plots on developments of 25 homes or more is un-evidenced and unjustified. Any requirement for self or custom build should be assessed through the review of the adopted Local Plan. The phrases "marketed appropriately" and "reasonable price" referred to at c) should be clarified.
Paul Dance Ltd	H	I act for the owners of the land outlined in red on the attached plan, which includes the western part of the Option for Development BR7, which is to the west of Dottery Road and is shown on Figure 12.4, the Options for growth at Bridport Plan. It holds potential for about 50 homes and we invite you to consider this land for inclusion for residential development in your plan.
BTC	H1 d	We would like to see a clear statement that Bridport needs genuinely affordable housing rather than starter homes.
BTC	H3	We suggest that Policy H1(d) be amended to read "Starter homes shall not be regarded as forming part of the 35% requirement for affordable housing." We ask that this requirement be checked for conformity with the Local Plan so that it can be enforced.
		At Policy H3, the Town Council would prefer to see a minimum time limit of six years rather than three years, provided this is legal and enforceable.

BTC	H4 a	We ask that the reference to "...the aged, the disabled..." at Policy H4(a) be replaced with "...people of all ages and abilities..." .
BTC	H5 a	<p>Policy H5(a)(3) does not read well, and could usefully be re-worded for clarity.</p> <p>Policy H5(a)(5) can be interpreted as contradicting itself. The first sentence requires that each phase will include at least 35% affordable housing. The second sentence allows for less than 35% where a greater proportion is included in an earlier phase.</p> <p>Unless the term "climate change challenge" at Policy H5(b) has specific technical meaning it would benefit from an objective definition.</p> <p>We suggest that the name "West Dorset District Council" at Policy H8(e) should be replaced with "the planning authority", to allow for the current (and any future) Local Government Reorganisation programme.</p> <p>We propose that Policy H8(f) allows for use by local workers as well as for holiday homes.</p>
BTC	H5 a	
BTC	H5 b	
BTC	H8 e	
BTC	H8 f	

Policy D

response from	Text error	Factual error	Policy reference	Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
90020760			D			D1 - D3: are you trying to stifle all progress? D4: Great but you cannot even take care of the current street furniture, plants etc or keep public spaces clean and safe. D5: meaningless. D6: When will you people realise that carbon is an elemental solid found as coal, charcoal or diamond(dependent upon molecular structure). The gas is carbon dioxide and that is the foot print you should refer to. CO2 makes up 0.04% if the atmosphere and man is responsible for 3.7% of that. That is a total impact on the atmospheric volume of 0.00148%. Not a lot really! D7: brilliant I will be able to get my telescope out but, please do not achieve this by switching off the streetlights after midnight and turning the place into a muggers and rapists paradise like St Andrew's Road became. Funny how the council offices at Mountfield are lit up like a Christmas tree all night. How's that for reducing your 'carbon' foot print			
90828803			D			These new buildings need to be eco-friendly - firm with local context, are energy efficient and enhance the fundamental qualities of the town. This is not a Poundbury development which, by general consent has not been a success, I hasten to add.			
91181815			D			West Bay is not shown. West Bay needs massive improvement – large parts of it are stark and/or ugly. This does not represent our area well. 'Greening' should be in harmony with the natural environment as much as possible, providing habitat for wildlife and native plants			
90828803			D			These new buildings need to be eco-friendly - firm with local context, are energy efficient and enhance the fundamental qualities of the town. This is not a Poundbury development which, by general consent has not been a success, I hasten to add.			
91392087			D			If pre-fabricated homes are considered does the above make it more or less likely?			
93529939			D			Modern design is ugly, anything eco friendly is generally ugly and whilst solar panels are obviously beneficial, they too are ugly. How will you achieve these lofty aims? Most of Bridport and its environs are old, you cannot achieve much unless you knock everything down and start again. Unless there is a nuclear winter and we get flattened (and obviously nobody will survive anyway!) there is no way you can turn Bridport into some Utopian fantasyland where the entire population powers their own homes, drives around in a silent electric car, cycles in family groups to the leisure centre. This is more idealistic nonsense.			
93452747			D			I don't support the proposed panel of "experts" to review proposed design of properties.			
Symondsbury PC			D			We note that the addition of our key villages in Symondsbury Parish has not been made, but understand that the information had not been received, so it has been resubmitted. We do question what this photographic survey adds to the Plan, but it probably does give a snapshot of our local communities. As long as they are perceived as general reference points, they are acceptable.			
93309179			D			New homes built must be appropriate to the area and not too densely built. Homes built in the later stages of the Poundbury development are an example of what not to build. No building should have more than 2 storeys or, if a third storey in the roof space the pitch of the roof should not be increased accordingly. A number of single storey (bungalow) homes is needed of the aging population who do not want to live in a flat and want some private outdoor space. Parking should be adjacent to each house within the property boundaries. Courtyard parking is not popular with residents who will park as close to the front door as is possible whilst the courtyard car parks tend to be secluded and used by children as a play area in the absence of a garden of local play area. All developments must include areas of open space where residents can meet and children can play in safety. One option is to build houses around a grassed square where parents can observe their children whilst they play in safety. All new homes should be built with energy conservation in mind. The building industry needs to be encouraged to make interlocking PV cells that can for a roof (looking like slate) rather than the PV units sitting above the roof.			
93092785			D			The use of public art is great idea. Bridport is an art and craft centre and the inclusion of art in local places and centres is to be encouraged. A simple policy would be to require developers as part of the section 106 funding to commission local artists work.			

92697084 92358695	D D	<p>Housing Design Why cannot the public see a wide variety of design for dwellings? Variety does not need to add materially to the overall cost. Where a developer cannot be bothered about location of attractive estates residents feel none of the improvement in the quality of their lives that they might expect. Results that look and behave like the "H" blocks of apartments on Skilling Estate that face the football ground are retrograde. They do nothing to be in sympathy with the original houses on Skilling built from 1920. There are other developments of housing in the Town that ought never to have been approved. The trouble is that it seems that no one has any vision or imagination. The haste with which it is feared that more housing development will be approved just now requires that the way in which Building Control works would need to be overhauled. Opportunities for such thinking could well be denied to the detriment of the community. Brilliant ideas. Let's hope they can be put into practice.</p> <p>Design of housing is essential in keeping (or even improving!) the look of the town both for visitors and residents. What a shame policies like these were not in place throughout the twentieth century!</p>
92288839	D	
93629098	D	<p>s a general principle all new buildings should be designed to blend sympathetically with existing buildings or create additional interest through new innovative design though preferably using traditional materials. Each proposal should be judged on its own merits in this context and using detailed guidelines in the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Except for the upper end of the new-build properties, most of what we end up with are small, characterless boxes, adding nothing to the surrounding area. Good design doesn't have to be expensive, but as long as no one insists on it, we will get more of the same</p> <p>I would like to see more innovative modern design which I believe would enhance the older buildings if done sensitively. Some preserved building are ugly and of no historic interest. An area which never changes, never improves.</p> <p>is meaningless. "High quality" is no more quantifiable than the length of a piece of string, and "expected to be" is just a hope. Luckily, after this shaky start, it gets better.</p> <p>two storeys important. I've seen a few which exceed this and they stand out like a sore thumb.</p> <p>Height limitation was over-rated regarding the Churchill development in the town centre!</p> <p>object to the aim for 'optimum density' people need space.</p>
93700192	D1	
93648460	D1	
91139069	D1a	
93267771	D2	
93640180 93700192	D2 D3	
93267771 93648460	D4 D4/6	<p>Soft landscaping & trees important, some recent development would have really benefitted from this and enhanced the townscape.</p> <p>Excellent proposals</p>
89717956	D6	<p>D6 Solar panels on roofs (and on green field sites) can be unattractive.</p>
90306539 91139069	D6 D6a	<p>D6 - Could mean surveying all empty properties and putting them into good use.</p> <p>is badly worded. Development can not reduce carbon footprint.</p>
91139069	D6b	<p>6(b)(5) and (6) are the province of Climate Change policies surely? D6(b)(7) seems unattainable and should be deleted (or the writer's meaning expressed differently).</p>
91181815	D7	<p>solar lighting should be utilised whenever possible, as should motion-sensor lighting, for a balance of energy conservation and public safety.</p> <p>pleased to see light pollution has been included, it is so important! especially to the night sky. This is all good stuff</p> <p>Especially like D7 on light pollution. We experience good dark skies in the area, which we must preserve.</p> <p>Strongly support D7</p>
93267771	D7	
93084039 92586471	D7 D7	
Bradpole PC	Design	<p>Suggested additions to Housing Design Guidance: Pymore settlement, largely within Bradpole Parish, has a character of its own associated with its heritage. Any development needs to reflect this in design guidance. Similarly West Bay, not in Bradpole Parish has its own maritime character and any development should reflect this.</p> <p>Pymore to the parish descriptions (see pdf provided) NB Symondsburry to provide text on Broad Oak, Eype and WestCliffe.</p>
93865940	D6 - 4	<p>The reuse of rainwater and minimisation of impermeable ground cover is very important. However no mention is made that it needs to remain, so, buyers - companies need to maintain sustainable drainage systems - not replace with tarmac because it is cheaper to maintain.</p> <p>In the collection of parish photographs, there are no pictures of Bridport parish, and it would help if there were. D3. What is the definition of "optimum density", and would this policy preclude a development of less than optimum density?</p>
93820756	D3	
93806877	D2	<p>a) Pity this was not considered when building round West Bay harbour. D2 -</p> <p>c) Modern developments seem to go for 3 floors (i.e. Poundbury).</p>

93806877	D4	D4 - Providing the street are maintained through most of the area kerbs, pavements and pedestrian areas are a disgrace. Entry into town North, West and south the roundabouts are enough to make people turn away of pass straight through. D4 - e) This is a matter of personal opinion not public display.
93806877	D7	D7 - Why are street lights not light sensitive often they come on too early and go off too late. although its nice to have houses blend in in must be said that quite a lot of our housing stock is quite ugly. Perhaps we should be a bit bolder and allow more interesting modern designs and a fresher way of looking at housing design.
93901051		
Sym Estate	D1	c add 'where possible' after 'will be assessed' in the second line. not all developments will necessarily be able to meet these objectives. d add 'where appropriate' after 'housing shall'. It will not be appropriate in all case to require compliance. f, add 'where appropriate' after 'application should' It may not be appropriate for a development to comply infall cases
Sym Estate	D2	c, delete. The point is covered in criterion a. with the reference to appropriate height which may differ in certain cases. e, delete unnecessary. the design and its rationale is an intrinsic part of a D&A statement
Sym Estate	D3	a, delta the word 'urban' in line 4 . not all of Bridport plan area is urban
Sym Estate	D4	a, and c it is not appropriate to expect public spaces to be of the highest quality in all case. This is in any event a subjective term. Place with 'good'. a, not all development in the plan area is relevant to the town centre. Add after All development 'if applicable'. b replace 'high quality' with 'good' as above
Sym estate	D5	
Sym Estate	D6	b, add 'if applicable' after 'Applicants should' as all developments may not be appropriate to the application of the criteria in the policy
93884001	D2	Limits on height, mass and materials are really important. D3 - ditto. Most of Allington is grim! Pebbledash, metal railings, 60's/70's architecture. There should be initiatives for tenants to paint exteriors, keep gardens attractive, not use gardens as parking spaces. I have bought an ex-local authority house in Court Orchard. There is rubbish in people's gardens, dog poo, depressing pebble dash. IT could look really appealing, create a 'young vibrant' community if people were encouraged to paint colourful exteriors and take care of the gardens.
93802365		
93782324	D6	Solar panelling should be installed only when this would not detract from the overall character of the immediate area. Overall these policies could draw out the importance of coherence with the local area rather more. Mitigation of light pollution - Street lighting is one of the most mis-understood aspects of design. Everybody and their dog thin (believe) they know all about it, they don't. The lighting installed a few years ago in East/West Street is a perfect example of how not to do it, it is truly appalling in every way! Why use expensive 'Yancy' collums when you have buildings of the ideal height, Crazy, and why compound the error by painting them black? Crazy again, reducing street clutter? Apparently not in Bridport, money to throw away it would seem. Compare it to lighting in South Street Bridport and high East Street/West Street Dorchester. Good lighting should be invisible during the day and safe-efficient at night, it should not be an eyesore! It should also not be a maintenance liability for the future! Policy D7 (page 91 of document) as written is meaningless 'waffle' written by someone with no knowledge of the topic at all! important to avoid street 'clutter' from excessive signage, utilities and road markings. Encourage public art.
93732666	D7	
93727632	D4	
94046016		- Try to avoid overbuilding and respecting our green spaces/fields. - Particularly as other green fields should be cherished - i.e. "the lungs" of the town also with the advent of Brexit we must retail farmland and be productive. - Utilise the empty spaces of buildings/shops within the town.
CG FRY	D1	It would be inappropriate for all new housing applications to have to demonstrate compliance with HAPPI. This is neither a national nor a local validation requirement and it is not a requirement of the adopted Local Plan. We make the following comments on the checklist that should be covered in Design & Access Statements: Guidance on the content of Design & Access Statements is found at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-an-application#National-informationrequirementswww.gov.ukplanning.portal (Paragraph: 032, Reference ID: 14-032-20140306)
CG FRY		

CG FRY		<p>This cannot be amended through a neighbourhood plan. Not all applications for development require a Design & Access Statement. It would not, therefore, appropriate for Design & Access Statements to consider all the elements set out within the checklist at Appendix B. Many of the requirements - especially A Site & surroundings - are more of "land-use policy" than "design checklist" and in any event largely duplicate existing Plan policies.</p>
CG FRY	D6	<p>Part a) seeks the reduction of the carbon footprint through good design but fails to quantify or justify the level or reduction being sought.</p>
CG FRY	D7	<p>The design and specification of road lighting and columns is undertaken by the local highway authority (in this case, currently Dorset County Council). This is not a matter that is within the gift of a developer or one that can be subject to planning policy, regardless of whether or not this is a laudable objective. Part c) is not supported by evidence and is therefore unjustified.</p> <p>The Town Council notes that, in the Design section of the plan, there is a neighbourhood focus on the identities and local distinctiveness of the parishes surrounding Bridport, but no such focus on Bridport and West Bay. We would welcome this as an addition to the document, providing an opportunity to highlight, for example, areas such as Seymour Place, Barrack Street, St. Michael's Lane, the Skilling estate (an example of a 'garden village') and St. Swithins Road. We appreciate that the Town Centre section covers some parts of Bridport, but significant areas of distinctiveness are not covered.</p>
BTC		<p>The Town Council notes that, in the Design section of the plan, there is a neighbourhood focus on the identities and local distinctiveness of the parishes surrounding Bridport, but no such focus on Bridport and West Bay. We would welcome this as an addition to the document, providing an opportunity to highlight, for example, areas such as Seymour Place, Barrack Street, St. Michael's Lane, the Skilling estate (an example of a 'garden village'), St. Swithins Road, and examples of distinctive housing in other conservation areas.</p>
BTC		<p>The Town Council would appreciate assurance that the design standards at Policy D1(c) are demonstrably suitable and appropriate.</p>
BTC		<p>We question whether the two-storey restriction at Policy D2(c) is appropriate in all cases, for example in the case of apartment buildings. We suggest that the scope for exceptions be clarified such that they may be allowed where the development does not adversely impact on the street scene or the AONB.</p>
BTC		<p>We are concerned that the provisions in Policy D3(b) may encourage undesirable 'urban infill' or 'backyard' developments, and ask that the wording avoids this.</p>
BTC	D4 a	<p>At Policy D4(a) we ask that the words "where appropriate" be added at the end. This is to avoid unnecessary clutter and to allow for simple green spaces where these are desirable.</p>
BTC	D4 c	<p>The wording of Policy D4(c) could be argued to conflict with that of D4(a), which (as currently worded) may give rise to 'clutter'.</p>
BTC	D6 b 6	<p>Should the term "local forms of power" at Policy D6(b)(6) refer instead to "local generation of power"?</p>
BTC	D6 b 8	<p>At Policy D6(b)(8), consideration could be given to including options that allow appropriate and reasonable changes to listed buildings that improve their energy efficiency. Existing provisions, for example the current blanket policy that rejects solar panels and double glazing, means that opportunities for energy efficiency are being lost</p>

Projects

response from	Text error	Factual error	Policy reference Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
90755525			Projects		Nothing on open spaces on wildlife in the list in summary document. Support - Review of traffic speeds, etc for pedestrians and cyclists. - height caution. the chamber requests the inclusion of a project to foster links between local schools/colleges and local businesses to improve apprenticeships and potential jobs for local students and school leavers, to support development of local industry and retention of skills in Bridport. We are keen to help young people afford to stay in Bridport (and create an environment where they will wish to do so) and to take a 'bigger picture' approach this also needs to include affordable housing, higher paid jobs and improved facilities/retail outlets for younger members of the community			
CoT Andrew Flynn email Andrew Flynn email andrew Flynn email andrew Flynn email andrew Flynn email Andrew Flynn email			Projects pg 92	a business incubator (for profit) a fab lab skills training shop (plumbing, carpentry, electricity, pv and other renewable energy forms, etc.) p2p lending shop Culture and sport centre all the above should be made accessible and attractive to young people .				
			BTC		We believe that Project 12 should read "Promotion of..." rather than "Promote of..."			
			BTC		We support the proposed register at Project 16, but the proposal should specify which council(s) will manage the register. We consider that the planning authority is the appropriate custodian for the register.			
			BTC		At Project 32, we suggest that a link with the Bus Station be made by amending the wording to read "...making physical connections between St Michaels, the Bus Station and Plottingham..."			
			BTC		At Project 34, we would ask that the legality of a town or parish council holding the personal details of landlords be investigated. At very least this would require landlord permission, which may not readily be given.			
			BTC		At Project 36 the Town Council will want to satisfy itself that sale of land below market value is legally acceptable, and the precise circumstances under which this would take place.			

Vision

response from	Text error	Factual error	Policy reference	Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
91181815			vision			<p>it should be amended to read: "... and IMPROVE ease of moving about within it." This is in particular reference to public transport, the commercial nature of which means that it is under-invested and services are being drastically cut, leaving many with inadequate or even no means of transport within the area. Vision for Symondsbury: surely the gigantic Vearse Farm development will completely go against the statement, "Maintaining Symondsbury parish's rural nature is important"</p>			
89350775						<p>Zero Carbon is a good aim, but general low running costs also count for a lot, so specify some technologies or developers will not generally adopt them so will be a niche application in a few high cost developments again not affordable by a local workforce.</p>			
Rep Watton Hill Trust						<p>Page 7 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that it has 'sought to extend the amount of common ground between residents, business groups and other stakeholders'. There are proposals in the Watton Hill area which directly affect my clients landholdings, in particular the designation of land for a local green space under policy LH4. My client is concerned that at no stage have they been consulted regarding these provisions which could have a serious impact on the viability of their landholdings. There is no mechanism in the plan for its implementation and the achievement of public access, although the proposals for the wider area submitted to the Local plan review could provide a mechanism for its implementation. As matters stand however the proposal cannot be supported and it should therefore be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>			
BTC						<p>The Town Council is grateful to the NPJCC and the wide range of stakeholders involved in developing the submission draft. We are very pleased that the plan area incorporates Allington, Bothenhampton & Walditch, Bradpole, Bridport and Symondsbury; we consider that this demonstrates co-ordination on development matters, and collaborative working.</p>			
BTC						<p>The Council also welcomes the plan's emphasis on sustainable development and climate change mitigation.</p>			
BTC						<p>Although the Council has suggestions for amendments to the document, these should not be considered as overall objections to the plan, which we support</p>			
BTC						<p>We suggest that the 'Vision for Bridport' be amended to read "...meets the present and future needs of all who live and work in, and who visit the area.'</p>			
BTC						<p>We consider that the needs of visitors – practical facilities such as parking, toilets, tourist information should be considered, alongside the wider tourist 'offer' – landscape, attractions, shopping etc.</p>			

Text

response to	Text error	Factual error	Policy - wording change	Policy - new	Discretionary changes	Accept change	Reject change	Rationale
DCC			Neighbourhood plans are policy-based land use plans that need to be in general conformity with the local development plan. Currently these comprises: the local plan for Bridport and the surrounding area is the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan 2015. (Weymouth & Portland Borough Council adopted this plan on 15 th October 2015 and West Dorset District Council adopted the plan on 22 nd October 2015.)					
DCC			the Bournemouth Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy (adopted May 2014),					
DCC			the remaining saved policies of the Dorset Minerals & Waste Local Plan (originally adopted April 1999) until their replacement is confirmed upon adoption of the emerging Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Sites Plan,					
DCC			the saved policies of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Local Plan (adopted June 2006) until their deletion is confirmed by the adoption of the emerging Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan.					
DCC			The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Sites Plan (pre-submission draft) – December 2017 and Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Sites Plan (pre-submission draft) – December 2017 and Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan (pre-submission draft – December 2017 which are at an advanced stage and are material considerations in determining planning applications. It is anticipated that the Mineral Sites Plan and Waste Plan will be adopted in late 2018/early 2019.					
DCC			These is adopted local plans forms the main basis for making decisions on planning applications.					
BTC			To improve the document's inclusivity, the Town Council asks that references in the document to "people with disabilities" be replaced with "people of all abilities"					
BTC			We recommend the inclusion of more standards and targets in the plan policies, so that more objective judgements can be made when assessing development proposals against the requirements of the plan.					

Objectives

Objective 8 – amend to read “To protect **and enhance**...”. This helps to emphasise that the supporting policies aim to achieve both of these.

BTC

Objective 10 – amend to read “To **support and** expand...”. Again, this helps to emphasise that the supporting policies aim to achieve both of these.

BTC

Objective 12 – amend to read “To encourage tourism which uses local services, **events**, facilities...”. This will reflect Bridport’s support for events as a key element of its visitor offer

BTC