



# Dorset Council Local Plan



## Wool

2021 Consultation  
Summary of Responses



January 2023



Dorset  
Council

## Contents

Contents.....	2
1. Wool.....	3
1.1. Introduction .....	3
1.2. Vision.....	3
1.3. Development strategy.....	4
1.4. Village centre strategy .....	6
1.5. Settlement wide issues .....	7
1.6. Main development opportunities.....	12
1.7. Policy WOOL1: Land to the west of Wool.....	13
1.8. Policy WOOL2: Land to the west of East Burton.....	15
1.9. Optional additional site – land south of Hillside Road.....	18

## 1. Wool

### 1.1. Introduction

#### Paragraphs 21.1.1-4

##### Wool Parish Council

- Paragraph 21.1.3 – there is an ongoing enquiry regarding the problem of surface water flooding.

##### RSPB

- Lack of mention the close proximity of Wool to the Dorset heathlands or the River Frome.

##### Environmental groups

- Paragraph 21.1.4 Amend first sentence to “Develop around the village will need to respect the heritage of the area, its relationship with the nearby AONB, the internationally protected heaths and ecological networks”

##### Public response

- Paragraph 21.1.4 - Query how aims in terms of creating better links, supporting existing facilities, and minimising risk of flooding will be met, as this isn't described in the document.
- Paragraph 21.1.4 - Be sympathetic to topography of Wool with rising fields.
- Paragraph 21.1.3 - This is an important point why is it not expanded upon in the document?

### 1.2. Vision

#### Paragraph 21.1.1

##### Wool Neighbourhood Plan Group

- Vision makes no reference to the Wool NPG’s vision for Wool, which was derived from 2000 comments.
- Our vision is to sustain a thriving, friendly, safe and desirable parish community.
- Our objectives are:
  - To ensure the building of attractive, good quality new housing that minimises the potential for crime, with excellent interconnectivity and integration with the existing built environment, to maintain a strong sense of community.
  - To provide a range of affordable and market properties in line with local housing needs
  - To ensure that new housing provides greenery, recreation and open space.
  - To ensure that development is sympathetic to local landscapes, the adjoining Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and our historic environment.
  - To protect and enhance the environment and local wildlife habitats.
  - To support and sustain community facilities and services, including social, sporting and leisure facilities and medical services to ensure we sustain a thriving, friendly community.
  - To support a range of employment opportunities in the parish to ensure the parish thrives.

### Wool Parish Council

- Remove reference to Thomas Hardy – not justified.

### Wool Flora and Fauna

- It is not a vision but a nightmare where wildlife is replaced with urbanisation. Vision should be to keep its uniqueness and maintain its position as top of the country for levels of biodiversity. It should promote ecotourism and pursue becoming a national park.

### Public response

- Vision is confusing – it should be a clear statement of the result of proposed developments or improvements.
- Vision is full of errors / too vague.
- Can't see how we can have "enhanced green spaces" if all the green fields to the west and south of the village disappear under new housing.
- Agree that the vision for Wool should be to retain its rural village character, but concern with reference to a 'town centre', which is contradictory.
- Additional houses and infrastructure are not in keeping with the vision.
- How will developing in Wool reduce travel, as most people will work in Dorchester and/or conurbation.

## 1.3. Development strategy

### Housing need and scale

#### Wool Parish Council

- The Purbeck Local Plan plans for “around” 470 dwellings plus 65 extra care units; this cannot be increased again if the views and wishes of the community are to be respected.
- Changes to planning legislation, plus impacts of Brexit and Covid may mean that there is no need for extra housing.
- Housing Needs Register suggest need for 24 AH units.
- No evidence to support the view that expansion of DIP will require the number of houses previously envisaged, let alone the newly introduced 400 extra houses.
- The number of local people who work at DIP is very small.
- No evidence-based justification for the 65-unit extra care facility – if there is a need then there should be a restrictive covenant attached preventing change of use.

#### Langton Matravers Parish Council

- Langton Matravers Parish Council does not object to emerging policies relating to Wool.

#### Wool Flora and Fauna

- Should be no housing allocations in Wool.

#### Poole and Purbeck CPRE

- The proposal that Wool and Moreton Station should get the majority of the proposed housing in Purbeck ignores the high quality of the natural environment at Wool and the inadequate infrastructure services and facilities at Moreton Station. The presence of a railway line does not of itself provide adequate infrastructure services and facilities.

## Savills on behalf of Lulworth Estate, Redwood Partnership, A&M Properties (Dorset) Ltd

- The landowners support the identification of land within their ownership at Hillside Road in addition to the Wool 1 and Wool 2 sites for housing led development.
- A strategic housing allocation of this scale at Wool would represent sustainable development, and would be a 'sound' policy decision as it is a suitable, sustainable and deliverable site with no unacceptable environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated.
- The Purbeck Local Plan Examination has considered all relevant issues and representations, with no further matters arising.
- The enclosed Wool Concept Framework provides the latest updated vision for the Wool 1 Site and a separate submission sets out the vision for the WOOL 2 site.

## Public response

- Tier 3 settlement having 770 homes is more than double any other tier 3 settlement and more than tier 1 settlements and Wareham.
- Concern over housing numbers - No evidence for the need for 535 dwellings in the Purbeck LP and certainly none for the 935 in the DCLP.
- The local housing need calculated using government's methodology is overstated - there is a local need for 50 homes to rent or buy).
- Concern over 40% increase in current housing stock without justified need.
- Section 21 should be removed completely and replaced by the Purbeck Local Plan.
- Unclear where housing need is from as natural population is declining.
- No evidence that DIP will require or justify the number of houses planned.
- Plans out of scale with existing village.
- No evidence to support the 65 extra care facility.
- Concern over impact to houses planned to the north of the A352.
- The development of 470 new homes to the west of the village was strongly opposed at the Purbeck Local Plan stage. I think a development of around 250 would be acceptable.
- Purbeck Gate is frequently cited as an example of bad planning in Wool.
- Understand that the real require for houses actually in the area is low, possibly less than 20.
- Suggest building another village elsewhere.
- Suggest developing in stages to improve assimilation with existing developments.
- Previous consultations made clear that 470 homes and a 65 bed car home were agreed – it is therefore grossly unfair to propose further.
- 80% of responses objective to Purbeck Local Plan and this has been ignored.
- Wool ought to be considered as a properly planned and self-sustaining eco town as it has a large Innovation Park and a railway.

## Biodiversity

---

### Wool Parish Council

- Plan provides insufficient detail regarding the SANG provision. The location is not accessible and will offer little benefit to residents on the western end of Wool, north of A352. No details of the management of the SANG are given.

### Arne Parish Council

- Disagree with growth proposals at Wool. Area is rich in biodiversity. Proposals are out of scale with the existing village, would replace farming land, and threaten the R Frome catchment with increased pollution and drainage. No jobs locally, so will place additional commuting on the already busy A352 and A351.

### Natural England

- An additional paragraph is needed to describe the requirement for all development at Wool to meet the nitrogen neutrality in respect to the Poole Harbour Habitats sites.

### Environmental groups

- Paragraph 21.3.3 - rewrite last sentence to “In order to avoid impact to heaths, priority habitats and species and ecological networks, etc., deliver an appropriate level of housing and community access to sufficient and appropriate green space a coordinated approach is required by DCC, NE and DWT.”

## Winfrith Nuclear Site

---

### Nuclear Decommissioning Agency

- Suggest that the plan should include policies relating to the Winfrith Nuclear Licensed Site to support decommissioning, waste management and land remediation processes.
- We have previously made land available within the Nuclear Licensed Site for heathland and employment uses (with the potential for in-situ waste disposal and phased long-term restoration to heathland).
- We note Policy 10 of the Waste Plan which allocates the Nuclear Licensed Site for decommissioning and employment uses.

## Dorset Innovation Park

---

### Public response

- How is DIP going to get the massive amounts of employment? Without milestones such as number of jobs created to be monitored and reached, housing should not be 'unlocked'.
- Where is evidence that more jobs will be provided?

## Infrastructure

---

### Arne Parish Council

- Existing sewage works is at capacity.
- Railway level crossing disrupts the flow of the main road leading to congestion at peak times.
- Existing school and surgery are not adequate to cope with more people.

## 1.4. Village centre strategy

### Wool Parish Council

- Object to the promotion of main town centre uses in the village.
- This section appears to encourage the redevelopment of existing employment sites, such as Wool and Bovington Motors.

## Historic England

- Notes the aspiration for an improved town centre, however there is no corresponding policy to support this.
- The consultation map shows another town/village centre in the High Street within the Conservation Area. Given this, the Council should consider the impacts of this policy intent on the Conservation Area and make adjustments to policy and its explanatory text as required.

## Public response

- Concern over the suggested focus for development along Dorchester Road between The Square and Colliers Road.
- Need for car parking not just retail on Colliers Lane (not road).
- Against proposals for improvements to retail facilities on offer in Wool and formation of a 'town centre'.
- Seems to be a vision to create a new town.
- There are no sites between Dorchester Road and Collier's Lane which are likely to come up for redevelopment.
- Village needs a decent supermarket but this isn't possible within the existing village so needs to be on a new site.
- Paragraph 21.4.2. - It is not clear where or how these facilities will be developed. The area specified in this paragraph is too small. More explanation is needed.

## 1.5. Settlement wide issues

### Housing

#### Public response

- Concern whether 'affordable housing' will be a reality.
- Should be smaller homes for those wishing to downsize.
- Need for increased number of affordable homes - for local workers and carers to live locally and support aging population - suggestion of traditional terraces such as in Broadmayne.
- Affordable homes are needed for key workers.
- Concern regarding new housing and integration into the community.
- Infilling and use of land around the edge of the village is preferable to one large development - smaller neighbourhoods with better integration.
- More bungalows or accessible one bedroom flats - unsure if a care home would be sustainable - where would care workers live?
- Supports increase in line with local affordable housing need.
- More homes will not help younger people get a home and will compound Carbon footprint.
- Proposed homes are not likely to be affordable for local people.
- More bungalows needed.

### Employment and economy

#### Public response

- DIP does not provide much employment / does not provide employment to local people.
- General cuts within the military and a reduction in the planned use of armoured vehicles will not increase future opportunities at Bovington and Lulworth.

- Concern with building a 2nd hub, and impact on businesses elsewhere in the village.
- While additional houses at Wool might provide homes for workers at the Winfrith Innovation Centre, there is concern over the skills and expertise required.
- A house in Wool would not be a good base from which to change jobs, since the majority will be in the conurbation or outside Dorset.
- An innovation centre would not require large numbers of workers – it is brains, skills and expertise that make a successful innovation centre not the old-style preponderance of people.
- Why cannot Wool have a mini nuclear reactor power station?
- Will the local plan make allocations connected with the Ford dealership on Dorchester Road?
- Concern that over the last 15 years Dorset Innovation Park has tried and failed to attract new business.
- Departure from the EU needs to be considered in relation to enterprise bids etc which are not likely to be funded in future.

## Transport, access, connectivity

---

### Wool Parish Council

- Paragraph 21.5.1 – Disagree - Bovington Garrison is not “well connected to the village”; NP is looking to improve the connectivity between Wool and Bovington.

### Go South Coast Buses

- Object to WOOL1 & WOOL2 – allocations are distant from existing bus services – therefore unsustainable.
- Subsidy for service 105 was withdrawn in 2017.
- Wish to work with the LPA and developers in terms of what might be possible re. developer contributions to provide a service.

### Bournemouth Transport Ltd trading as Yellow Buses

- While Wool Rail Station provides an hourly service to Dorchester and the Conurbation, there is a question mark over access to the Dorset Innovation Park (DIP).
- There used to be a bus service running between Bovington and Wool Rail Station. This route could be extended to DIP and also to serve the new estates with 700 houses.
- This should provide a critical mass to support a one vehicle all day operation. The funding required to pump prime this would be £350k over 4 years.

### Wool Flora and Fauna

- The A352 is slow moving and causes pollution in villages along its route.

### Public response

- Bovington Garrison is not well connected to the village.
- Although there is a good train link there are very few buses, and the “hub” is a long walk from East Burton and the western side of Wool, including the “innovation” park.
- Concern over level crossing - suggestion of a mini roundabout at the Wool side of the crossing near to the station.
- Lack of parking at Churches.
- Lack of bus service in west of Wool.
- On street parking issues.
- Every new home should have off-road parking.



- Need a link between Bovington and Wool - long walk between the two.
- Insufficient car parking at Wool station.
- The railway station should be moved to Dorset Innovation Park and a flyover built over the railway line.
- Road congestion on lanes will make walking/cycling dangerous.
- There is good accessibility around the village for walkers/cyclists/those using mobility scooters.
- Rail services do not provide an alternative to use of the private car.
- Wool Bypass should be formed.
- Against moving railway station to Dorset Innovation Park - less accessible to local people.
- Limited scope to form new car parking for the railway station.
- Wool residents have lost a footpath and railway crossing point.
- Will the development improve accessibility?
- Majority of commuters travel by car as rail services are expensive, infrequent and unreliable.
- There will be greatly increased demands on the road network - Asking people to use the C6 (officially a minor road) is no solution.
- The rail crossing will become even more congested.
- Need for a by-pass for Wool with a dual carriage way link to the M27 as a starting point.
- You will not attract companies to invest in the area without good road links - Most companies need to be within a 15 or 20 min. link to a motorway.
- Concern with extra traffic rat-running through East Burton.
- Without a radical solution, i.e. a flyover or underpass, the traffic queues will only continue to be a greater problem than at present.
- Intersection of railway and major road creates considerable congestion - railway bridge would be good to solve issues.

## Biodiversity and environment

---

### Wool Flora and Fauna

- No consideration of biodiversity, climate change, development strategy. Landscape and sustainability.
- Wool parish is rich in hedgerows which are a priority habitat, providing high levels of biodiversity and habitat linkages, particularly between Combe Wood and the water meadows. Removal of hedgerows will result in loss of species and may impact on foraging route of Daubenton bat. Suggest 2m buffer during construction. All hedges on the development site are over 30 years old. EAD records of hedgerows are not wholly accurate. Hedges around WOOL1 are some of the oldest in parish. Who will pay for like for like replacement and management of hedgerows. Should select sites that are not rich in trees or hedgerows.
- Wool parish has 51 priority species, many on development sites or in Coombe Wood (details provided).
- Mitigation measures could prove ineffective. An independent EIA should be produced for each development site.
- Consideration must be given to the impact of lighting on bats particularly their foraging routes. The development sites are on the route of bats foraging between Coombe wood, the water meadows and beyond.
- Development should avoid sites with high numbers of priority species. The council should select less sensitive sites.
- Should have a statement protecting priority species and habitats.

- The use of Coombe Wood is unacceptable – will result in loss or deterioration of ancient woodland and veteran trees. Compensation strategy not appropriate. This view is supported by the Woodland Trust and Purbeck Local Plan Inspector in her amendments. Challenges Natural England's view.
- Nutrient mitigation proposed is inadequate. Only option is to insist on nitrogen stripping at sewage treatment works. Can not protect the river Frome from pollution. Benefits of development do not justify damaging the River Frome. Increased sewage likely to compromise priority fish and otters. Increased pressure on riverside footpath.
- Nearly 50% of the parish is covered by conservation designations from local to international.
- Development does not avoid adverse impacts on biodiversity features. Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol is sound but not applied in Wool. Wool allocations on organic fields rich in priority species (30% more diverse than standard agricultural fields) and a natural corridor; 800 homes will have a significant adverse impact on biodiversity; Should be avoiding the impact rather than mitigate.. Biometric test will not be able to demonstrate a net gain in Wool due to the level of existing biodiversity.
- Questions Natural England's support for development in the area.

### Public response

- Wool could be part of a National Park in the next 5 years.
- Concern regarding impact on wildlife, biodiversity and habitat.
- Fields to the south of the A352 should be used to form a 'wildbelt' – to reduce risks from flooding, enhance biodiversity, provide green space and increase prospect of Purbeck being a national park.
- Development will have adverse impacts on heathland habitat sites.
- Inappropriate to use North Wood as SANG as it is Ancient Woodland – harm to biodiversity.
- SANG location provides little benefit to residents and is too far from new housing, access is narrow with no footways.

## Infrastructure

---

### Wool Flora and Fauna

- Need new school, upgrade sewerage works to include nitrogen stripping and upgrade roads.

### Public response

- Concern over infrastructure capacity – traffic, GP surgery, public transport, schools.
- Concern over loss of farmland – field to the west of Wool is an organic farm.
- Need for infrastructure to be delivered prior to development.
- Need for a new primary school.
- Query whether a big store would represent local level of community.
- No shopping facilities for increased population.
- Is there a need for retail floor space? Already vacant shops.
- Will gas and electricity substations cope?
- Concern with wording around delivery of infrastructure, such as "The developer will be expected to... provide, explore, include, etc." – query how these would actually be delivered.
- Need for extra wastewater and sewerage – at capacity.
- Need for upgraded power supply, internet and mobile connections.
- Need a new local hospital a second doctors surgery with doctors, a NHS dentist, a manned police station, fire station.

- Believe that building west of East Burton is a better solution than south of the Dorchester Road which is of better Agricultural Quality (2-3 on DEFRA scale).
- Lack of childcare provision.

## Flood risk and drainage

---

### Wool Flora and Fauna

- Should ensure avoidance of all sources of flooding; There are regular occurrences of flooding from the river to the north and west of the development sites; Flooding frequency likely to increase with climate change; During times of heavy rainfall there is increased run-off from the fields to the south of the proposed developments, including Winfrith roundabout; Proposals to support new flood management schemes are laudable but will not be implemented in time to resolve issues around proposed houses. Should be avoiding flooding, not mitigating.
- SuDs swales could be overwhelmed by flash flooding. SuDs may not be appropriate at Wool due to high water table.

### Public response

- Concern over flooding – land to the north floods.
- Natural springs in the area would affect plans.
- Underlying geology (chalk) and thin soils make the area susceptible to surface water flooding.
- There have been a number of flooding incidents in recent years (including flooding on local roads and homes on Frome Avenue and Purbeck Gate development).

## Landscape, character, and heritage

---

### Public response

- Concern over impact on the character of the area, e.g. Wool will no longer be a 'village'.
- Concern over impact on views from property.
- East Burton has not yet joined to Wool and has its own identity – concern over its loss.
- Concern with ribbon development along Dorchester Road.
- Importance of visual quality of buildings - do not use multicoloured rendering as at Purbeck Gate.
- Will the level of growth mean that Wool is no longer be considered a rural village?
- Why is some of the land around Wool not AONB?
- Historically there were three distinct settlements of Wool village.
- Development will have adverse impacts on the AONB.
- What is being done to conserve the Romano-British settlement?
- Query how building a large number of houses can help maintain the views and retain the rural character of the village.

## Green infrastructure

---

### Wool Flora and Fauna

- Should assess how much GI is needed post development; Wool already has green infrastructure, including hedges and drove ways. Threatening existing green infrastructure. Concerns over allotments and large churchyard. Should plant 3 trees for each new house.
- Trees are important in the landscape and for biodiversity – 26 of 35 native species found in Wool parish. Trees become a carbon sink once they're 20 years old. Trees will be inevitably lost as part of the development. 25 veteran trees in the SANG.

### Public response

- Query how green spaces will be enhanced - concern that SANG will not be better than leaving green spaces as they are.

## Recreation

---

### Public response

- Suggest the need for a large recreation ground - swing park, skateboard park and pavilion, and entertainment for youths.

## Design

---

### Public response

- Homes should be built to high standards (sustainable construction and design).
- New housing should provide greenery, recreation and open space.
- Poor quality housing at Purbeck Gate and not big enough for a family

## Amenity, community, and health

---

### Wool Flora and Fauna

- An almost doubling of the population will mean existing residents will feel overwhelmed and threatened.
- Development and associated losses will not enhance safety and wellness.

### Public response

- The allocation at Wool also enhances the exclusivity, in serving migrant retirees, 2nd and 3rd homers, and holiday lets.
- Concern that pipeline running through part of the allocation is contaminated.
- Is there a need for noise mitigation from the railway line?
- Concern over risk of health to residents from increased air pollution.
- Existing issues with anti-social behaviour from bored youths in the village.

## 1.6. Main development opportunities

### Paragraphs 21.5.1 - 21.5.3

---

### Public response

- Paragraph 21.5.1 – Dorset Police HQ has been omitted from the list of employment sites.
- Paragraph 21.5.1 - There is absolutely no hard evidence that jobs will be created especially now with the double ‘shock’ of Brexit and Covid.
- Paragraph 21.5.2 - if it is a cluster of excellence and will attract business- where is the evidence? Need evidence to justify the new build.
- Paragraph 21.5.3 - Concern that statements regarding the site in Dorset Council ownership is a fantasy. Concern with how development would be funded in terms of new roads, lighting, drainage etc.

## Dorset Innovation Park Enterprise Zone

---

### Historic England

- There is no associated policy with this allocation.
- There are numerous scheduled monuments located near to the allocation. Settings of some listed buildings may also be affected.
- We would welcome clarification of how the allocation and its associated policy will seek to conserve the significance and settings of these designated heritage assets.

### Wool Flora and Fauna

- Dorset Innovation Park will not provide a wide variety of jobs for an increased workforce - Wool will become a commuter town.

## 1.7. Policy WOOL<sub>1</sub>: Land to the west of Wool

### Transport, access, connectivity

---

#### Wool Parish Council

- Paragraph 21.5.8 - There are no good routes between the station and DIP – claims being made in the Plan are simply not feasible.
- The only location at the station that could be used for more car parking is an area that Network Rail have consistently said is not available.

#### Savills on behalf of Lulworth Estate, Redwood Partnership, A&M Properties (Dorset) Ltd

- The Wool landowners continue to question whether the requirement to ‘include mitigation measures for any safety risks at the level crossing, as proposed through a traffic statement or safety assessment, satisfying the requirements of Network Rail and the highways authority’ is justified..

#### Public response

- Paragraph 21.5.8 – cycle route is a longer route than the intuitive route, improved access to DIP should take lessons from this.
- Paragraph 21.5.8 - I support improving cycling and pedestrian links between the DIP and the station (there needs to be a cycle/footpath along Dorchester Rd between station and the junction with Collier's Lane). There is no bus service along Dorchester Road passing the DIP.
- Paragraph 21.5.8. - Who will pay for the proposed access opportunities and ‘changes to the railway station area’.

### Biodiversity

---

#### Natural England

- Objection – further information required.
- The site appears to be permanent grassland – in order to avoid harm to priority species and habitats an ecological assessment of the site should be completed prior to allocation.

### Environment Agency

- Green space should be incorporated into the site where possible. This should include areas of wildlife habitat and seek to link up any existing green corridors. Wetland features in the site should be considered if appropriate.

### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- Welcome the recognition of heathland and the need to provide SANGs through a co-ordinated master planning approach between developers, Dorset Council and Natural England (para 21.3.3) and inclusion of SANG requirements in policy WOOL1.

### Environmental groups

- High levels of housing and the potential in-combination effects of WOOL1 and 2 will increase recreational pressure on nearby heathland.

## Flood risk and drainage

---

### Environment Agency

- A flood history search for these sites should be undertaken prior to allocation, given existing surface water runoff issues in the village.

### Public response

- Concern with flooding in the area - heavy rain causing surface run-off, need for a very substantial drainage system.
- Planned development (including at construction stages) to the south of the A352 at Wool is likely to increase surface water flooding at Baileys Drove and Frome Avenue Wool.

## Infrastructure

---

### Sport England

- There should be contributions sought towards indoor and outdoor sports facilities.

## Housing

---

### Public response

- Developers should consider the construction of 2-3 story blocks of flats offering either affordable social housing or sheltered accommodation.

## Retail

---

### Public response

- Paragraph 21.5.7 – need for retail space is unclear, and there are already unused retail units.
- Paragraph 21.5.7 - Query what the impact of convenience floorspace will be - Encroachment on Wool Playing Field? More information is needed.

## Climate change

---

### Public response

- New houses should address green issues regarding insulation and the use of solar panels etc, having low carbon footprint and largely powered by renewable energy.
- Need to reduce waste.

## Criterion II.

---

### Natural England

- WOOL1-II – welcome the requirements for SANG, however the location needs to be provided.
- WOOL1-II – a further bullet is required setting out the need for development to achieve nitrogen neutrality and secure a biodiversity net gain: “The development should be at least nitrogen neutral and provide high quality multifunctional SuDS designed and appropriately maintained to achieve a high level of attenuation of urban silt and phosphorus. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement on the site should be considered at the earliest stage and used to inform the structure of the development in order to deliver the minimum 10% net gain required.”

### RSPB

- Welcome and SUPPORT para II, specifically the requirement to provide adequate SANGS to prevent adverse impacts on the Dorset heathlands through increased recreational pressure arising from new housing.

### Public response

- WOOL1 II - Unclear about what improvements to the C6 could improve traffic volumes around Wool.

## 1.8. Policy WOOL2: Land to the west of East Burton

### Housing

---

#### Homes England

- While Homes England’s objective is to commence development of c.26 affordable homes within its land ownership ahead of the new plan period, it supports growth at WOOL2.

#### Public response

- More than 10% should be affordable housing.
- Site is more suitable than West of Chalkpit Lane.

### Biodiversity

---

#### Natural England

- Objection – further information required.
- The site appears to be permanent grassland – to avoid harm to priority species and habitats, an ecological assessment of the site should be completed prior to allocation.
- The development must provide a SANG – details need to be included in policy WOOL2.

#### Environment Agency

- Green space should be incorporated into the site where possible, this should include areas of wildlife habitat, and seek to link up any existing green corridors. Wetland features in the site should be considered if appropriate.

#### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- We recommend prior ecological survey and assessment of WOOL2 and the area for proposed SANG associated with this site.

- Without sufficient ecological information the viability of the development cannot be determined.
- WOOL2 should include a statement regarding the need to provide SANGs in line with other policies in the LP.

### RSPB

- It is unclear why the policy and accompanying text does not refer to the need for SANGs for this proposed allocation.
- Object to the current wording of these policies and recommend inclusion of suitable paragraphs in the policies.

### Environmental groups

- High levels of housing and the potential in-combination effects of WOOL1 and 2 will increase recreational pressure on nearby heathland.

### Savills on behalf of Lulworth Estate, Redwood Partnership, A&M Properties (Dorset) Ltd

- No further policy issues need to be covered for the policy 'land to the west of East Burton' other than in respect of confirming SANG provision and for the policy to retain sufficient flexibility.

### Public response

- Biodiversity net gain in Wool is impossible; there are 20 priority species including Nightjar recorded feeding on one site will lose habitats.

## Flood risk, water, and drainage

---

### Environment Agency

- The FZ2 and FZ3 parts of the site should be avoided for built development.
- A flood history search for this site should be undertaken prior to allocation, and the current surface water flood risk considered.

### Public response

- Much of the land experiences severe flooding – area has numerous springs.
- Unsuitable for development due to flood risk.

## Landscape, character, heritage

---

### Historic England

- Northern part of this area has high heritage sensitivity due to proximity to listed buildings (in particular, Dizzy Cottage). This is not reflected in the Policy or supporting text.
- Include new supporting text that describes the heritage assets that may be potentially affected by development.

### Public response

- Proposals will double the size of Wool and turn it into a small town.
- Fields are organic farmland.



## Transport, access, and connectivity

---

### Homes England

- We are open to working with DC to explore opportunities for linkages to East Burton.

### Public response

- Need for multi-use trail between Winfrith Newburgh / East Knighton / Wool to facilitate active transport to facilities in Wool and for recreational use, needs to be suitable for cycling, horses and walking.
- Will increase traffic volumes and roads around East burton are in bad state - risk of accidents due to state of road.

## Employment and economy

---

### Public response

- Query the demand for commercial units on Dorchester Road?
- Small retail outlet and cafe needed as it's quite a walk to the facilities.

## Infrastructure

---

### Sport England

- When considering formal outdoor space, it is important to base decisions on the adopted playing pitch strategy.
- Contributions should also be sought for indoor sports provision.

### Wessex Water

- No objections to this allocation.
- Local connections to public water supply and foul networks are subject to application.
- High level strategies will require review to support this proposal.
- Surface water and flood risk strategies must be in accordance with national and local policies.
- No surface water connections to foul sewers.
- Existing apparatus crossing the site will require easement and protection - damage to apparatus will result in compensation claim.

### Homes England

- Paragraph 21.5.11 - the playing pitch not “in use” – and has not been since 2013 as recorded in the Playing Pitch Strategy.
- Provision of a playing field at this location would not be the best plan-led solution – a location closer to the village centre would provide greater benefit in terms of accessibility and community use.
- Amend supporting text recognise that playing fields are not in use and reference to re-provision in their existing location is removed.

### Public response

- Sites are grades 2 and 3 agricultural land – look at lower grade land first.
- Playing field is a community asset and not enough space in the village to relocate, add a play area for little children.

## Criterion II.

---

### Natural England

- WOOL2-II – a further bullet is required setting out the need for development to achieve nitrogen neutrality and secure a biodiversity net gain: “The development should be at least nitrogen neutral and provide high quality multifunctional SuDS designed and appropriately maintained to achieve a high level of attenuation of urban silt and phosphorus. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement on the site should be considered at the earliest stage and used to inform the structure of the development in order to deliver the minimum 10% net gain required.”

### Environmental groups

- Amend WOOL2 II to state how impact to heathland will be managed and if there is a requirement for new SANG.

## Additional criteria

---

### Historic England

- Add to WOOL2 a new criterion requiring the development to conserve and enhance affected heritage assets, including the grade II listed Dizzy Cottage.

## 1.9. Optional additional site – land south of Hillside Road

## Housing

---

### Wool Parish Council

- Para 21.5.13 – concern that this new site for 100 dwellings could be delivered before the main site for 470+ dwellings; Also, the statement about it providing a very different housing product is vague and meaningless.
- Para 21.5.14 - What is being proposed is not about meeting local need, but about developer greed. There is no evidence that this scale of housing is needed at Wool. The village will become a dormitory town for people moving from the Bournemouth/Poole conurbation.

### Environmental groups

- No further allocations should be considered at Wool. Current and proposed development have to prove they function at site option level and have no in-combination affects. The current and proposed scale and speed of development is too high and may not be sustainable.

### Arne Parish Council

- Against – for the same reasons as those listed above.

### Public response

- Do not support the allocation of land to the south of Hillside Road for housing.
- Paragraph 21.5.13 - “A very different housing product” – concern that houses may fill with second homeowners.

## Biodiversity

---

### Natural England

- The development must provide a SANG – details need to be included in policy WOOL2.

- Before considering the optional site, the following should be provided: details of scale and location of SANG; an ecological assessment of the site.

### Environment Agency

- Green space should be incorporated into the site where possible, this should include areas of wildlife habitat, and seek to link up any existing green corridors. Wetland features in the site should be considered if appropriate.

### Dorset Wildlife Trust

- No direct concerns relating to reserves or SNClS in this area, but there are Conservation Verges that need to be considered.
- Before the proposed development is progressed further, a full ecological survey should be undertaken, including the potential effects of this development on designated sites within the wider area.
- Without sufficient ecological information on the presence of priority habitats and protected species, the scope for avoidance/mitigation to protect biodiversity on site and within the wider environment, opportunities for net biodiversity gain on site, and the possible position/design/size of development and open space/SANG cannot be assessed, or the viability of the development determined.

### Public response

- Area of high biodiversity.
- Impacts on RAMSAR sites of Frome Valley and Poole Harbour.
- This is totally unacceptable as it will impact on the Cress Beds which are the source of the Wool Stream. There is potential environmental impact on the receiving River Frome.

## Flood risk and drainage

---

### Environment Agency

- Welcome that a drainage strategy would be required to manage any flood risk on site. Sustainable Drainage Systems should be incorporated if appropriate.

### Public response

- Could increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
- Inappropriate location for housing - field below is a source of the springs that feed into the village stream.

## Landscape, character, heritage

---

### Historic England

- Potential impact to conservation area, listed buildings, non-designated heritage assets, archaeology, and scheduled monuments.
- Care will need to be taken in the drafting the policy criteria for this potential allocation to ensure that development is designated to avoid and minimise any harm to the significance of all heritage assets as set out in the evidence base.

### Dorset AONB Team

- Within the setting of the AONB, contains some relatively elevated land where development may need to be limited or excluded to safeguard views. A detailed LVIA would be required to explore this issue and consider appropriate design and landscape mitigation measures.

## Public response

- The option site is sensitive from a landscape perspective - forming part of the setting for the AONB when viewed from the south and the context for Wool in the river valley when viewed from the north.
- Site visible from and close to conservation area - adversely affect historic character.
- Already huge number of homes planned - extra would have real impact on village.
- Houses would change village into small town without supporting infrastructure.
- Destruction of rural setting.

---

## Transport, access, and connectivity

### South Western Railway

- This is a sustainable location for travel as noted by the plan and further strengthens the case for the improvement of facilities at Wool station.
- Sustainability is also supported by the large amount of employment land allocated at DIP.
- Good cycle links to the station are important.
- A contribution to expand the new shared bike scheme due to start shortly will also be required.
- Access would be an issue through existing narrow residential lanes.
- Lack of provision for access.

---

## Infrastructure

### Sport England

- Contributions should be sought for indoor and outdoor sports facilities.

### Wessex Water

- No objections to this allocation.
- Local connections to public water supply and foul networks are subject to application.
- High level strategies will require review to support this proposal.
- Surface water and flood risk strategies must be in accordance with national and local policies.
- No surface water connections to foul sewers.

### Public response

- Will remove a very valuable green open space within the village. Further diminishing the quality of life for residents, reducing wildlife, degrading landscape. Some infill must be resisted in light of the loss of character.
- Schools already oversubscribed.
- Query what are the 'new facilities' which will be offered?
- Concern with the loss of green space.