



Dorset Council Local Plan



South East Dorset Functional Area

2021 Consultation
Summary of Responses



January 2023



Dorset
Council

Contents

Contents.....	2
1. South Eastern Dorset Functional Area.....	3
1.1. Introduction	3
1.2. Changes to the Green Belt and Policy SED1: The South East Dorset Green Belt.....	5
1.3. Comments in respect of Green Belt release at specific settlements.....	11
1.4. Housing and employment allocations in the South Eastern Dorset Functional Area.....	12
1.5. Omission sites	18

1. South Eastern Dorset Functional Area

1.1. Introduction

Function and issues (paragraph 7.1.2 and figure 7.1)

Town and Parish Councils

- Respondent notes that local roads in the Purbeck area are congested and that the proposals for housing allocations will exacerbate this issue.
- Respondent does not consider that the Leigh Road Sustainable Travel Corridor will reduce the movement of cars / vans from the proposed housing allocations that travel southwards from Wimborne to the large built-up area.
- Respondent notes that the description of Upton in figure 7.1 does not reference which parish council area it is located within (i.e. Lytchett Minster and Upton).
- The plan include sub-area targets for each Functional Area based on genuine spatial strategy (Pimperne Parish Council).
- The parish council notes that there are no regular sustainable transport links to the conurbation so queries if it is right to meet the housing needs of the conurbation and will add to A350 congestion (Pimperne Parish Council).
- The parish council notes that employment proposed is likely to be lower than in the conurbation (Pimperne Parish Council).
- The parish council notes that transport modelling for SE Dorset area commissioned in 2019 does not consider Blandford as part of the FE and new cycling and walking improvements across SE Dorset did not extend past Corfe Mullen/Wimborne (Pimperne Parish Council).

South Western Railway

- The role of the rail stations in the BCP area as railheads for the development sites needs to be recognised and infrastructure improvements included in developer funding contributions - particularly in relation to Poole and Bournemouth Stations, including bus interchange enhancements, additional car parking, station building and platform facility improvements.

Cranborne Chase AONB Team

- Lack of clarification on why Blandford has been included in this area, together with fairly distant villages such as Sixpenny Handley.

Public response

- The road infrastructure in this part of Dorset is poor, and that the development identified in the allocations is likely to create congestion on roads and traffic pollution.
- Respondent is concerned that proposed allocations will lead to loss of recreational space and farmland.
- The introductory chapter should reference Dorset's ecological networks.
- Query the distribution of development between Iwerne Minster (35 homes) and Fontwell (67 homes) when Iwerne Minster is larger than Fontwell.
- Respondent notes that many of the settlements in South Eastern Dorset have elderly populations and suffer from a lack of affordable housing.
- Respondent notes that Corfe Mullen is not referenced individually in Figure 7.1 of the local plan.

- Blandford Forum should be re-defined as part of the Northern, as opposed to the South Eastern, functional area because: the town is orientated toward Northern and Central Dorset, and that there is little connection, or relationship, between residents of Blandford and towns and villages of South Eastern Dorset.
- Respondent notes that the B3390 is inaccurately referenced as A353 in Figure 22.4
- Wimborne Minster and Colehill should be referenced as a single settlement (reference paragraph 7.1.2).
- Concern with affordability of housing in the area for purchase and rental.
- Need for homes for essential workers, low paid renters, self-builders and in particular young locally linked first time buyers.
- Need for adaptable properties to suit the 60+ age group and those with disabilities.

Environmental constraints (paragraph 7.1.3 and figure 7.2)

Natural England

- The references in this part of the local plan (paragraph 7.1.3) to environmental considerations as a constraint is unhelpful. Suggest that the local plan should also make references to the environmental advantages conferred by these habitats for local communities and the opportunities to improve / expand on these services.
- Suggest that the local plan should also refer to the impacts of air pollution on habitat sites, and that this part of the plan should also reference specific protected species (including Horseshoe bats which forage/roost in this area). These insertions should be made as part of Figure 7.2.

New Forest National Park Authority

- In regard to paragraph 7.1.3, the text of the local plan should reference the proximity and relationship between the South Eastern Dorset Functional Area and the New Forest National Park, and the council's statutory 'duty of regard' towards the two statutory National Park Purposes.
- In regard to paragraph 7.1.3, the text of the local plan should also reference the range of internationally designated sites in the New Forest.
- The council should take account of national planning policy (in the National Planning Policy Framework) around the setting of National Parks when preparing its local plan.

RSPB

- Welcome recognition of the importance of Dorset heathlands but the language is unhelpful and negative – i.e. referring to them as 'constraints affecting' many settlements.
- Welcome reference to the 400 m development buffer to Dorset heathlands at Ferndown & West Parley, St Leonards & St Ives, Verwood and West Moors.

Cranborne Chase AONB Team

- The environmental constraints, in paragraph 7.1.3, underestimate the extent of the areas designated as AONB and also fail to recognise that in some areas the AONB designation overlaps with the green belt designation;

Environmental groups (non-statutory)

- Respondent considers that the text in paragraph 7.1.3 should be expanded to reference priority habitats and the requirement to enhance biodiversity (in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework). Respondent suggests that the following text should be inserted into this paragraph of the local plan: 'to be sustainable proposals have to conserve, restore enhance

priority habitats and species’ and ‘establish coherent ecological networks that connect designated sites.’

- Respondent notes that the local plan does not include any ‘baseline’ environmental / ecological surveys.
- Respondent notes that the second volume of the local plan does not reference the climate change and ecological emergency, the objective of maintaining / enhancing biodiversity as major asset or the opportunities to achieve complementary objectives / stack benefits (e.g. managing and mitigating flood risk whilst also enhancing biodiversity).
- Respondent suggests that the local plan should clarify which types of development are inappropriate close (within 400 metres) to protected heathland habitat sites and the reasons for this (this would be particularly helpful for those parts of settlements which are defined as part of the 400 metre area around protected heathland habitat sites).
- Respondent notes that some references (e.g. Verwood’s population) have not been made consistently across the local plan.
- Respondent suggests that the council might wish to reference the numbers of shops in each of the settlement chapters within the local plan, and revise descriptions so that they make reference to topography, underlying geology and important biodiversity.
- Respondent notes the potential impacts of nutrient pollution on aquatic habitat sites in this part of Dorset (Poole Harbour and River Avon) and surrounding areas (The Solent).

1.2. Changes to the Green Belt and Policy SED₁: The South East Dorset Green Belt

The need for development in South Eastern Dorset (paragraphs 7.2.1 - 7.2.2)

Public response

- Respondent considers that the council should re-assess local housing need (having regard to the Covid-19 pandemic, Brexit and inaccuracies population assessments) and its relevance as a consideration when assessing whether there are exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.
- Respondent does not consider that locally assessed housing need (using government’s method) should be treated as an exceptional circumstance, and that: the locally assessed housing needs used in preparing the local plan are overstated, the housing requirement should be adjusted to reflect the Green Belt and local circumstances.
- Respondent does not consider that Green Belt release can be justified if the council seeks to oversupply for new homes (i.e. a supply of sites with a capacity which exceeds the locally assessed housing need), and the council should not seek to meet housing needs from the conurbation.
- Development needs in South Eastern Dorset have been satisfied through development allocated in adopted development plans and existing planning permissions.
- Respondent does not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to release land from the Green Belt for industrial development, shops or offices as there is no locally assessed need for these kinds of development.
- Agreement with the need to release land from the Green Belt due to housing shortages.
- Concern with the impact of Green Belt release on communities.

- Suggestion to explore other options such as creation of a new town or expanding villages/towns where more housing is being called for by local residents.

Justification for changes to Green Belt boundaries (paragraphs 7.2.3 - 7.2.4)

Town and Parish Councils

- The council has failed to evidence that it has fully explored the opportunities, through its 'duty to cooperate', for neighbouring areas (including Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council) to meet Dorset Council's need for development. (Meeting development needs outside Dorset Council area would limit or avoid the need for release of Green Belt in the council area).
- The council has not fully evidenced and justified proposed Green Belt release, in particular the opportunities to meet development needs outside the Green Belt.
- Respondent considers that changes in Green Belt boundaries should not lead to net reductions in Green Belt extent. And suggests that any loss of Green Belt should be offset by defining additional Green Belt elsewhere, thereby reducing, or compensating for, the impacts of development on the environment and biodiversity.
- Believe that Green Belt should only be released as a last resort when all other Brown Field sites have been exhausted.

RSPB

- The plan should recognise the outstanding wildlife value of some brownfield sites (eg Holton Heath), and ensure that their wildlife value is fully factored into the mitigation hierarchy.

Cranborne Chase AONB Team

- Concern with emphasis on removing land from the Green Belt over including additional land as compensation.
- Green Belt should be extended to include additional countryside areas to sustain the green belt concept.

Public response

- Council has not fully evidenced or justified exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries (there are opportunities to meet development needs within existing Tier 1 & 2 settlements on previously developed land at higher densities, on previously developed land within Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council area, and in suitable locations outside the Green Belt [including Aderholt]).
- Development in South Eastern Dorset should be limited to brownfield land (including small and medium sized sites outside the Green Belt) and for those development schemes that are 'net zero carbon'.
- Respondent considers that the council should publish a list of alternate brownfield sites for development and notes that the council has not provided a summary of the Green Belt background paper.
- Concern that Brownfield land and other alternatives have not been considered.
- Respondent notes that there are alternative development sites (East Dorset District Council Offices, Pippins and an old school at Redcotts) in Wimborne Minster, and elsewhere (including the former Cordite factory at Sandford), that could deliver homes without releasing Green Belt.
- Respondent considers that providing suitable accommodation for older people in the right locations (within existing settlements and close to services / facilities) would release existing housing stock into the market to meet the needs of younger people, and therefore avoid or limit the need to release Green Belt to deliver new homes.

- Respondent notes that further previously developed land in existing settlements is likely to become available following the Covid-19 pandemic, changing patterns of work and shopping behaviour, and that development on this land would limit or avoid the need to consider Green Belt release.
- Respondent does not consider that developers have been given sufficient opportunity to promote alternate development sites outside the Green Belt.

Achieving sustainable patterns of growth in and around the Green Belt (paragraphs 7.2.5 - 7.2.7)

Natural England

- The council has not taken account of ecological considerations when preparing its development strategy.

Environmental groups (non-statutory)

- Green Belt release sets a precedent for further release, and Green Belt release is not sustainable.
- Proposed Green Belt release, and the development of these sites, would lead to isolated pockets of remaining habitats (i.e. Ferndown Common, Poor Common, Parley Common and Merritown Heath).

Developers/Landowners/Agents

- Respondent expressed concern that proposed options for new homes around Alderholt are not deliverable in the short term because of the need for joint working between multiple landowners and neighbouring councils.
- Support proposed Green Belt release in sustainable locations around key settlements (including Wimborne Minster and Colehill) in South Eastern Dorset.
- Respondent concurs with the council that it has fully evidenced and justified exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt.
- Respondent consider that there are further opportunities for Green Belt release around Wimborne Minster and Colehill, and the council has not properly justified discounting several sites around Colehill taking account of national planning policy around sustainable patterns of development.
- Respondent supports Green Belt release around Sturminster Marshall.
- Respondent would support a detailed review of Green Belt boundaries to address anomalies and to create clear defensible boundaries (as part of this the council should consider release of land along Wimborne Road [east of Canford Bottom Roundabout]).
- Respondent considers that the council should broaden the scope of Green Belt release to encompass land around satellite settlements (including around Verwood in the Crane Valley).

Public response

- Respondent considers that the council should plan to conserve the Green Belt.
- Respondent considers that as part of the process of considering Green Belt release, the council should take account of potential impacts on access to the countryside and recreational uses (including the keeping of horses), and it should only consider Green Belt release where evidence indicates that existing activities or uses would not be compromised.
- Respondent considers that Green Belt release will have adverse impacts on the local environment (including biodiversity).

Dorset Council Local Plan consultation 2021 summary of responses – South Eastern Dorset Functional Area

- Respondent considers that the proposed release, and re-development, of Green Belt amounts to overdevelopment of Dorset.
- Respondent considers that the council has adopted a piecemeal approach to Green Belt release in South Eastern Dorset, and that as an alternative it should consider strategic larger scale Green Belt release for a new town in a sustainable location which could support high intensity development and which would allow appropriate investments in infrastructure to be delivered alongside new homes (including renewable energy, broadband, transportation, recreation facilities and electric vehicle charging points).
- Respondent opposes Green Belt release on the grounds of loss of trees, losses to biodiversity, harm to the character of the countryside / existing settlements, loss of Green Infrastructure, loss of spaces for recreation, and harm to peoples' wellbeing.
- Planned development in the Green Belt is not likely to be appropriate for older people because of its edge of settlement location where it would be difficult for residents to access services and facilities.
- Respondent considers that Green Belt should be retained for tourism.
- Council should rule out all development in the Green Belt when assessing suitability through its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
- The council's approach to Green Belt release is inconsistent with the way it deals with planning applications for development in the Green Belt / the process for considering these applications.
- Respondent suggests that the council should consider how it can promote nature recovery and climate action in the Green Belt.
- Respondent suggests that any changes to Green Belt should be precisely defined to avoid challenges when taking planning decisions, and the council has not presented evidence around defining Green Belt boundaries where it proposes release.
- The council has not considered safeguarding Green Belt land for future release.
- Respondent considers that the council could consider permitting Green Belt release for development, provided the development was 'high quality' with significant architectural merit and environmental credentials.
- Respondent considers that the land around the Green Belt is a sustainable location for growth.
- Respondent agrees that some buildings will be required in the Green Belt.
- The respondent does not consider that Green Belt should be protected from all development and suggests that the council should also consider allocations for development in towns (Swanage) and villages (Church Knowle, Studland, Corfe Castle and Lulworth) in Purbeck.
- Respondent supports windfall development at those settlements within the Green Belt to provide local homes for local people.
- Respondent does not consider that the proposed housing allocations in this part of Dorset are in the most sustainable locations.
- Respondent does not consider that the local plan includes a mechanism for delivering small and medium sized sites in the Green Belt. The respondent considers that additional small and medium sized sites would make the council's housing land supply more resilient.
- Respondent considers that more development sites should be allocated in South Eastern Dorset to meet the needs of the conurbation.
- Respondent supports release of Green Belt for affordable housing.
- Respondent supports Green Belt release in Dorset Council area to avoid building at higher densities in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole areas which could increase transmission rates of Covid-19.

- Respondent does not consider that the emerging local plan includes allocations to meet the needs for development from neighbouring areas.

Exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries (paragraph 7.2.8)

Town and Parish Councils

- The respondent notes that paragraphs 7.2.7 and 7.2.8 of the local plan refer to changes to Green Belt boundaries around Wareham. Elsewhere in the local plan, section 15 relating to Wareham, the council is not proposing changes to Green Belt boundaries around Wareham. The inconsistencies between these different parts of the local plan should be resolved.
- Any release of Green Belt has to be considered against the five purposes of Green Belt as defined in the NPPF and must be the minimum required to meet the exceptional circumstances set out in paragraphs 7.2.8 to 7.2.10.

Natural England

- The council has failed to evidence that Green Belt release can be compensated through improvements to environmental quality and accessibility to remaining Green Belt (defining habitat site mitigation projects, including Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace or strategic Green Infrastructure, would assist with this).

Cranborne Chase AONB Team

- Exceptional circumstances to contemplate development in the green belt seems almost entirely related to the housing needs of the Bournemouth, Christchurch, and Poole conurbation rather than the needs of the local Dorset communities.

Environmental groups (non-statutory)

- The local plan does not consider the in-combination effects of Green Belt release.
- Only support Green Belt release where council identifies compensatory enhancements to remaining Green Belt (i.e. biodiversity and access).
- Respondent considers that it is not correct that the council treats 'improvements to environmental quality' as an exceptional circumstance (in specific reference to the proposed allocations CORM3 to CORM5 and WMC6 to WMC8).

Developers/Landowners/Agents

- Respondent supports the council's position that there are exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries, and that the list of exceptional circumstances provided by the council 7.2.8 justify strategic Green Belt release.
- Respondent supports the methodology used by Land Use Consultants to assess and rate the function of the Green Belt having regard to the purposes described in national planning policy.
- Respondent considers that the Stage 2 assessments in Land Use Consultants report are inconsistent with the Stage 1 assessments of contribution to Green Belt purposes (with specific references to the assessments around Corfe Mullen and in particular Haywards Lane).
- Respondents do not agree with some of the assessment ratings in the councils Green Belt report, including those relating to Green Belt around Wimborne Minster and Colehill and Corfe Mullen (specifically parcels CM2, CM4 and CM5 which the respondent considers should be re-assessed as having moderate harm to ensure consistency with the assessment relating to CM8).
- Respondent notes that the council's summary (as presented in its Green Belt background paper) on harm arising from release of Green Belt at allocations CORM3, CORM4 and CORM5 is

overstated and does not reflect the findings from the Stage 2 assessment completed by Land Use Consultants.

Public response

- The respondent does not agree that the council's exceptional circumstances outweigh the impacts of Green Belt release on its function or setting of settlements (including Sturminster Marshall) in the Green Belt, and that further justificatory evidence required.
- Planning constraints should not be treated as exceptional circumstances.
- Respondent considers that as a finite resource (which cannot be restored or replaced), Green Belt should not be released for development as a matter of principal and proposed Green Belt release will act as a precedent for further changes.
- Respondents consider that there is a need for Green Belt, and release of land from the Green Belt would undermine its function. And that the Green Belt should be conserved (not only for its openness but for its recreational use and biodiversity) and enhanced.
- Respondents consider that Green Belt was defined to check sprawl from the large built-up area and to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another, release of Green Belt undermines these purposes. And that all existing Green Belt in Dorset serves the functions defined in national planning policy.
- Respondent considers that the council should have rated Green Belt parcels against the objective of preventing urban sprawl.
- The council should not consider Green Belt release where its evidence indicates release and development would give rise to a 'high' level of harm, it should only consider changes to Green Belt boundaries where release would give rise to 'low' harm, and it should give greater weight to Green Belt as a consideration when preparing its development strategy.
- Respondent suggests that changes to Green Belt boundaries should be agreed by local communities.
- Respondents consider that Green Belt release will damage Dorset's natural beauty, and that the council should not release land from the Green Belt for development where it would be next to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Respondents consider that the council's Green Belt assessments do not consider cumulative impacts of releases on Green Belt or the impacts of release on adjacent Green Belt. And that its Green Belt review does not take account of wider planning considerations related to changes to Green Belt release.
- Respondents consider that Green Belt cannot be released with each new local plan without adverse impacts on Green Belt function. And that the council should place long term limits on the amounts of Green Belt it would consider releasing.
- Respondent does not consider there are any exceptional circumstances for changes to Green Belt boundaries around Wareham.
- Respondent considers that Green Belt release should be compensated for by extending Green Belt boundaries elsewhere.
- The council has not identified opportunities to mitigate or compensate for Green Belt release. And considers that Green Belt release should be mitigated / compensated (in accordance with national planning policy) and proposals for Green Belt release for development should include measures to achieve ecological enhancements and be ecologically sustainable. Where mitigation is not adequate there should be no release of Green Belt.

1.3. Comments in respect of Green Belt release at specific settlements

Corfe Mullen

Public response

- Defining Upton and Corfe Mullen as part of the large built-up area ‘sets-up’ the case for Green Belt release around the edges of the settlement, that could in turn lead to unsustainable travel between planned and existing development.
- Parcels CM1 and CM10 (as defined Land Use Consultants reports) around Corfe Mullen all serve a significant function in checking sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and note that the harm rating for release relating to parcel CM8 does not appear to be consistent with adjacent parcels.

Ferndown and West Parley

Public response

- Respondent supports Green Belt release around Haskins Garden Centre (FERN10) which would allow the business to grow and provide more jobs.

Lytchett Minster and Lytchett Matravers

Public response

- Respondent suggests that it would be better to release Green Belt at Lytchett Minster for homes where it would also deliver a sizeable SANG (which would compensate for loss of Green Belt through enhanced access / opportunities for recreation in the remaining Green Belt).
- Respondent does not consider that Lytchett Matravers is a sustainable location for significant housing because of a lack of services / facilities / employers / poor public transport, and inadequate local roads. For these reasons the respondent considers that the proposed allocations are inconsistent with the national planning policy requirement to promote sustainable patterns of growth when reviewing Green Belt boundaries.
- The council’s sustainability analysis of Bere Regis and Lytchett Matravers are not consistent.
- Respondent suggests that the council should consider release of Green Belt to the north and west of Lytchett Matravers in preference to land to the south and east.
- Proposed Green Belt release around Lytchett Matravers would harm the villages character, biodiversity and restrict local peoples access to green space around the village.
- The Green Belt review incorrectly refers to Lytchett Matravers as a town, and the assessments relating to the first two Green Belt purposes (i.e. checking sprawl from the large built-up area and preventing neighbouring towns from merging) are not logical.
- Respondent does not agree with the assessment ratings for parcels LY7 and LY18 around Lytchett Matravers, the respondent considers that this land around Lytchett Matravers serves a function in preventing the large built-up area merging with Lytchett Matravers.

Sturminster Marshall

Town and Parish Councils

- With reference to Sturminster Marshall, alterations to Green Belt boundaries should be carried out sympathetically having regard to the character of the settlement and the village environment.

Public response

- Respondent opposes Green Belt release around Sturminster Marshall generally, and in particular Sturminster Marshall Golf Course (a valued community facility and resource, which encourages outdoor sport and recreation).

West Moors

Public response

- Respondent suggests that Green Belt boundaries around West Moors (Blackfield Farm) should be changed to re-define land as part of the Green Belt (the land was previously released from the Green Belt through the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy 2014), because this land is open, biodiverse / home to UK BAP species and serves several of the Green Belt purposes in national planning policy.

Wimborne and Colehill

Public response

- Respondent opposes Green Belt release between and around Wimborne Minster and Colehill on the basis that this land acts as a green lung, the Green Belt between these settlements prevents the towns from merging, release of Green Belt would adversely affect the setting of Wimborne Minster, release of Green Belt would adversely affect community identity, Green Belt release and development would have an adverse impact on the character of settlements, Green Belt release and development of land would lead to the loss of important trees, this land is biodiverse, and because development should be delivered on previously developed land in preference to the Green Belt.
- Wimborne Minster and Colehill should be treated as separate towns and the undeveloped space between them assessed accordingly having regard to the Green Belt purpose of preventing neighbouring towns from merging. Other respondents considered that Wimborne Minster and Colehill should be treated as a single urban area.
- Oppose proposed Green Belt release, and development, around Wimborne Minster as this would lead to a merging with Ferndown.

1.4. Housing and employment allocations in the South Eastern Dorset Functional Area

Housing development within and around the large built-up area (paragraph 7.3.2 and figure 7.3)

Town and Parish Councils

- Respondent does not consider that the local plan addresses the potential impacts (in particular on historic / environmentally sensitive landscapes, protected habitats and traffic movements [in

particular Holt Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest]) of proposed development allocations on nearby areas (Holt Parish area could be particularly affected by development around the edges of the conurbation and Wimborne Minster and Colehill).

Natural England

- Council should consider cumulative and in-combination effects of multiple housing allocations around / within settlements on habitat sites (including Dorset heaths).

Environmental groups (non-statutory)

- Respondent opposes proposed allocations CORM3 to CORM5 and WMC6 to WMC8 on the grounds of likely significant losses to biodiversity.

Other groups (non-statutory)

- The respondent objects to the development strategy for South Eastern Dorset.

Developers/Landowners/Agents

- Respondent considers that the council should prioritise supporting the delivery of homes on sites where a developer/landowner/agent can also guarantee delivery of habitat site mitigation for Dorset heaths.
- Respondent considers that the land around Wimborne Minster and Colehill is a sustainable location for development and notes that the opportunities to deliver development around Corfe Mullen, Ferndown and Upton are more constrained (having regard to habitat sites / flood risk) and states that re-focusing growth beyond the Green Belt would be less sustainable.
- Respondent considers that there may be other deliverable housing sites warranting allocation through the local plan around the edges of Wimborne Minster and Colehill.
- Respondent considers that homes should be delivered in the locations where new jobs are being created.
- Respondent emphasises the deliverability of homes on specific sites around Wimborne (WMC8: Land north of Wimborne Road) and Sturminster Marshall (STMR4: Sturminster Marshall Golf Course).
- The respondent notes that table in Figure 7.3 does not reference development sites in or around Alderholt (including the site at the Old Surplus Stores site on Daggons Road, land north of Ringwood Road at Hawthorn Nursery, or land included in Option 1). (Tanner and Tillet on behalf of Jim McIlwain).

Public response

- Respondent considers that local plan allocations should not support development of undeveloped land (particularly in South Eastern Dorset).
- Respondent considers that local housing need assessment is not up to date.
- There is a need for affordable housing, and those new homes delivered through the allocations will not be affordable.
- Council should reconsider its approach to development in the Green Belt in South Eastern Dorset, focusing instead on releases around settlements rather than the gaps between settlements which currently act as green lungs.
- Respondent suggests that the council should build a new town near to a railway line and good roads.
- Respondent is concerned about the levels (30,000) of new homes being considered for Dorset.

Dorset Council Local Plan consultation 2021 summary of responses – South Eastern Dorset Functional Area

- Respondents consider that locally assessed housing need (calculated using government’s methodology) exceeds local housing needs (respondent notes that many housing developments are already underway in the region). And that communities should have the opportunity to discuss their housing needs.
- Respondent considers that growth in South Eastern Dorset should be focused at towns and other main settlements which are inset within the Green Belt. Other respondents support focusing growth around Tier 1 and 2 settlements and Green Belt releases.
- Respondents suggest the need for homes could be satisfied locally in villages. And consider that growth should be focused close to existing facilities where development would help villages to become more sustainable.
- Respondent considers that the key driver for the local plan should be the council’s response to the climate change and ecological emergency.
- The proposed release of Green Belt for housing development would be out of character.
- The council should prioritise re-wilding within existing settlements.
- Respondent considers that the council has not given sufficient emphasis to Green Belt purposes when preparing its development strategy.
- The council should not make allocations for development through the local plan unless it is possible to resolve planning issues or those issues relating to constraints.
- Respondent considers that plan policies should seek to improve the quality of life for existing residents, rather than focusing on delivering further homes.
- Respondent considers that proposed development, and Green Belt release, would threaten the flood plain of the River Stour.
- Respondent considers that the council should propose housing allocations in sustainable locations, and that it is not clear that new homes are sustainably located close to employers.
- Respondent considers that increasing the supply of homes is unlikely to reduce costs.
- Respondents consider that the council should re-consider ranking Sturminster Marshall as a Tier 4 settlement because of its rural setting. And that a disproportionate (having regard to its location, services, facilities and transport links) level of growth is being considered for Sturminster Marshall.
- Respondent does not consider that the proposed allocation for homes at Sturminster Marshall Golf Course (STMR4) is suitable because it is an unsustainable location (Sturminster Marshall does not have the necessary infrastructure [local roads and lack of facilities] to support the numbers of homes being proposed).
- Development around Corfe Mullen will have an adverse impact on local character.
- Respondent does not support Green Belt release to the west of Pardy’s Hill Corfe Mullen (CORM3) as the allocation site is unsuitable for homes (with a poor access and subject to flood risk), nor the proposed release of Green Belt to the east of Haywards Lane (CORM4) as this allocation is also unsuitable (because of its wildlife interest).
- Respondent considers that a proposed allocation relating to Lambs Green near Corfe Mullen might be a more sustainable location for growth than the options selected by the council.
- Respondent does not consider that there is a need for further development in Wimborne Minster and Colehill.
- Development between Wimborne Minster and Colehill is likely to adversely affect biodiversity (including an impact on red kites, hedgehogs, birds, bats, owls, hawks, deer and foxes) and lead to the isolation of Leigh Common and Bytheway Field.
- Proposed housing allocations around Wimborne Minster and Colehill are at risk from flooding, trees would need to be felled along Leigh Road to deliver homes, Leigh Road would need to be

widened (leading to the loss of the existing verge) and it would not be possible to form a suitable access for allocation WMC7.

- Respondent considers that there is a lack of infrastructure, services and facilities in Wimborne Minster and Colehill to support the proposed further homes in the local plan allocations.
- Respondent considers that the council should consider Green Belt release and development to the north of Wimborne Minster and Colehill rather the sites which it has selected in the undeveloped gap in-between these settlements.
- Respondent opposes the proposed allocation of FERN6 and FERN 7 around Ferndown and West Parley on the grounds that development would lead to the loss of a golf course, pollution of the River Stour, congestion on local roads, the sites are not well related to the existing settlement or supported by services / facilities, one of the sites slopes, development on the sites would cause harm to the character of the area and because the development already permitted through planning permissions / allocations in existing development plans for this area would meet its housing needs.
- Respondent considers that the proposed allocation at West Moors is not suitable because of the risks from flooding, the lack of supporting infrastructure in West Moors for development and congestion on local roads.
- Respondent opposes the proposed allocations around Lytchett Matravers because of a lack of supporting infrastructure (including school places, doctors surgery and local public rights of way) for new development.
- Respondent notes that some of the proposed allocations in South Eastern Dorset are likely to adversely affect the setting of listed buildings.
- Some of the proposed allocations in South Eastern Dorset are inconsistent with Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (including those undertaken as part of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy).
- Respondent considers that rural housing will be occupied as second homes.
- Respondent considers that development should be closely related to existing bus routes to help support existing services.
- Respondent considers that the local Plan focuses too much on housing allocations.
- Respondent considers that planned development in South Eastern Dorset is higher than the other functional areas identified in the local plan.
- Respondent is concerned that proposed allocations will not be supported with appropriate infrastructure (including local roads, parking, schools, public transport, health facilities, vehicle charging points and public open space), and that demand related to proposed homes could overwhelm existing services and facilities.
- Respondents do not consider that existing sewers and sewage treatment works have capacity to support the planned development. And that there is insufficient water supply to support planned growth in South Eastern Dorset.
- Respondent consider that proposed housing allocations will 'degrade' quality of life in this part of Dorset.
- Respondent considers that the council should seek to reduce the carbon footprint of all new development.
- Respondent would support proposals for Dorset to be designated as a national park (this would also allow the council to set local targets for new homes).
- Respondent considers that Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems are needed to control, manage, and mitigate flood risks. Drainage systems must be designed to an appropriate standard.

- Proposed allocations (including allocations of undeveloped farm land) are likely to increase the risks from flooding.
- Respondents consider that the land which the council is considering for development is biodiverse and an important green space. And that the council should consider how it can promote nature recovery and climate action in the Green Belt, and prioritise maintaining ecological diversity and ecological networks. Respondents do not consider that it is possible to compensate for loss of biodiversity.
- Respondent considers that Green Belt release and development around Ferndown and West Parley (FERN6 and FERN7) is likely to have adverse impacts on Ferndown Common habitat site.
- Concern with the size of proposed developments in proportion to existing settlements.

Housing development beyond the Green Belt (paragraphs 7.3.3 - 7.3.4)

Environmental groups (non-statutory)

- Respondent considers that Alderholt is an unsuitable location for largescale development because it does not have the capacity, infrastructure or potential to be self-contained without major impact to its character and the local environment.

Public response

- Council should consider re-distributing growth across Purbeck rather than seeking to focus development around Wool and Crossways.
- Council should consider focusing proposed housing allocations in northern and western Dorset.
- Respondent considers that Alderholt is a sustainable location for growth (including meeting the unmet needs for homes from neighbouring areas).

Economic growth (paragraph 7.3.5)

Environmental groups (non-statutory)

- Holton Heath Trading Park (7.3.5 & Fig 7.3) - need for a policy covering this employment park as an allocation of 5.7 ha of employment land is referred to in the Plan - Concerns over the importance of protecting the sensitive wildlife of this site;

Other groups (non-statutory)

- Respondent notes that the local plan does not reference 'The Ferndown and Uddens Business Improvement District'. For these reasons the respondent objects to the proposed allocations in the absence of any proper analysis or consideration of the business improvement district.

Public response

- No need for further employment land in South Eastern Dorset and therefore not justification for Green Belt release.

Access, parking, connectivity and transport infrastructure (paragraphs 7.3.6 - 7.3.7)

Environmental groups (non-statutory)

- Respondent notes that the Transforming Travel programme measures do not apply to Alderholt, Corfe Mullen, Verwood or West Moors (paragraph 7.3.7).
- Development of the proposed allocations is likely to increase congestion on local roads (respondent notes that the opportunities to use public transport in Wimborne are poor).

- Respondent notes that the Ham Lane Cycle Path (south of Canford Bottom Roundabout) is little used because it does not effectively link into other routes (the cycle route along Leigh Road/Wimborne Road will not deliver users into Wimborne Minster).
- Creating cycle ways on existing roads are likely to reduce capacity for vehicular traffic and contribute to greater congestion and queuing.

Public response

- Proposed allocations are likely to exacerbate congestion on local roads (particularly between those towns and settlements positioned around the edges of the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole conurbation, through Ferndown, along New Road West Parley and at key junctions [Bere Cross Roundabout and Longham Roundabout], along key routes in the conurbation [including Northbourne Roundabout and along Whitlegg Way] and pinch points [Longham Bridge]), leading to unsustainable patterns of travel and increased pollution from traffic.
- Respondents note that the local plan / 'Transforming Travel Program' do not reference road improvements in this part of Dorset. And do not agree with the general aims of the Transforming Travel Programme described in paragraph 7.3.7 of the Dorset Council Local Plan, and do not consider that the Transforming Travel Programme (referred to at paragraph 7.3.7) will deliver any significant changes to peoples travel habits.
- Respondent does not consider that it is reasonable to assume that employment land at the airport is suitable for meeting the needs of south east Dorset residents (reference 7.3.7), and notes that there are limited employment opportunities around Wimborne Minster and Colehill.
- Respondent considers that investment is needed to improve Parley Cross, Tricketts Cross, Victoria Road, New Road Ferndown and Canford Bottom Roundabout, and that the West Moors bypass need to be completed.
- Respondent does not consider that new cycle and walking routes are likely to encourage people to travel actively to their places of work.
- Respondent considers that the council should invest to deliver a light railway to link settlements in South Eastern Dorset.
- Investments needed to deliver further buses on existing routes, and to create new bus routes and provide trams.
- Council should consider making use of a disused railway line to provide a sustainable travel link.
- Freight traffic from Poole port should not be directed through Gravel Hill to the A31.
- Existing traffic congestion and delays in South Eastern Dorset coupled with planned growth will create further congestion and adversely affect air quality.
- Improvements to Parley Cross will not address overall issues around congestion and delays on local roads around the settlement.
- A co-ordinated approach is needed to manage flows of traffic out of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole along the A338 and the roads in Dorset Council area to the west.
- Further information (i.e. previously developed land, part of the Green Belt, other restrictions on development) needed on the proposed allocations listed in Figure 7.3.
- Local plan policies should require traffic impact studies (focusing on traffic flow through existing settlements) to be undertaken.
- Respondent notes that the chapter relating to South Eastern Dorset does not refer to an improved railway connection between Swanage and the mainline.
- Respondent considers that new homes should be positioned close to railway lines.

Figure 7.4: South Eastern Dorset Functional Area key diagram

Cranborne Chase AONB Team

- Figure 7.4 – concern with spatial errors which are confusing and misleading;

Community groups (non-statutory)

- Respondent notes that the South Eastern Dorset key strategy map (figure 7.4) does not reference the Swanage Railway.

Swanage Railway

- The respondent notes that the key diagram (Figure 7.4) for the South Eastern Dorset Functional Area omits rail link from Norden to Wareham.

1.5. Omission sites

Crane Valley (LA/HORT/002) & Bulbury Wood Golf Courses (LA/LMUP/005)

Burry and Knight Limited

- Both Bulbury Woods (site ref: LA/LMUP/005) and Crane Valley (site ref: LA/HORT/002) site submissions were excluded due to being located outside the development boundary, within Green Belt and with potential to cause negative landscape and visual impacts.
- This appeared to be a blanket refusal to allow the full golf course sites to be allocated as sites for housing within the Local Plan process, even though we are aware of other golf courses in the county that have been given permission for such redevelopment.
- We submitted a clearer proposal for the specific provision of a retirement village complex with park homes on the 9 hole course on land to the north within the Crane Valley Golf Course while retaining the main 18 hole course and golf clubhouse.
- An appropriate site for housing specifically for the elderly and retirement community within Dorset.
- Crane Valley is located near to the edge of the town of Verwood and would therefore represent a sustainable location for permanent residential development.
- As park homes are based on caravans, these residential units would also provide affordable low-cost single storey homes within a designated retirement village complex supported by the existing golf clubhouse facility.
- This development would contribute towards providing housing that addresses the needs of older people as required by paragraph 61 of the NPPF and support the increasingly ageing population as stated in Section 4.5 of the Options Consultation document.
- Our client's golf course businesses have particularly struggled this past year from the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic closures, in addition to the general decline in golf participation over the last two decades.
- By being able to diversify the Crane Valley site to create this retirement village complex, it will help to support the continued operation of the golf course as a recreational sport, leisure and social facility for people in Verwood and the wider area.
- The retired residents living on site will also support the ongoing golf operation by bringing in additional memberships, green fee and clubhouse spending revenue to our client's business.
- Burry and Knight Limited land at Crane Valley sits close to the settlement boundary with Verwood and would benefit from the release of Green Belt land in their existing 9 hole golf course area to allow for specialist retirement homes to be provided.

Land at Church Road, Pimperne (LA/PIMP/004)

Wyatt Homes

- Pimperne - located two miles to the north-east of Blandford Forum, on the western side of the A354 which is a main road connecting Salisbury with Weymouth (via Blandford Forum and Dorchester).
- Potential to accommodate growth which would not only support the village's needs, but also provide housing in proximity of the Tier 2 Town Blandford, which provides a wide range of services and employment opportunities.
- Selection of services and facilities within the villages.
- NP provides for 45 homes through to 2031 - local plan stretches to 2038 - any delay to updating the Neighbourhood Plan will frustrate the delivery of housing sites within Pimperne village.
- Current village boundary provides few opportunities for growth as the boundary tightly follows already developed areas - also constrained by Conservation Area - approaches are too restrictive.
- Limiting housing development in Pimperne to existing completions, commitments, Neighbourhood allocations and windfall would be an extremely unsustainable approach with harmful medium and longer term impacts on the sustainability, population structure and economy of the village.
- Explanation of site context - neighbouring permission through NP. Nearby to school, village hall, play areas and other services. Visually contained by road and hedge. Slope down from west to east. Access through adjoining site.
- Technical work undertaken - landscape statement.
- Planning background - considered in SHLAA as part of wider area - overall developable with a potential yield of 15 units as per NP allocation on neighbouring site.
- Planning background in terms of the neighbouring NP allocation and permission - relevant technical work such as Transport Statement, FRA, Ecological appraisal, Tree Survey, Archaeological evaluation.
- Reference to attached concept masterplan - site is positioned to enable significant buffers to the Conservation Area to the south and south-east, site positioned on the lower slopes of the site in order to minimise the impact on the landscape.
- Enhance the hedgerow along the northern boundary of the site and provide a new tree copse to the north-west to help mark the arrival into Pimperne.
- Planting to the west of the site, consistent with the local landscape character, would restore a lost field boundary.

Land north of Down Road, Pimperne (LA/PIMP/001)

Planning Base on behalf of Mr V Carter

- Promotion of land North of Down Road - adjoins the settlement boundary, considered potentially acceptable in the SHLAA.
- Lack of allocations of land for housing in North Dorset villages - potentially unsound approach - villages are proven with Tier 3 status to be able to accommodate a responsible amount of new development and to safeguard the services and facilities of the Tier 3 villages there must be some controlled housing growth.
- Amending the village envelope to allow for smaller sites in acceptable locations will provide certainty to housing numbers and will serve to avoid large scale incursions into the open countryside which is damaging to the natural environment of Dorset.

- NPPF - highlights importance of small/medium sites and development to ensure vitality of rural locations.
- Settlement boundary extends northwards than the proposed site.
- Existing NP allocation for 15 dwellings - proposed site could accommodate a similar amount of development.
- Lack of constraints to the site - not in green belt and heathlands - possible to walk or cycle into Blandford from the subject site using pavements or footpaths.
- General approach in development strategy to under-estimate amount of dwellings required, and over supply new housing - in areas which don't have the same sustainability and accessibility credentials as the site north of Down Road.
- Reference to planning constraints of Dorset, and need to meet unmet needs of neighbouring LPAs.
- Seems logical to include additional housing in Tier 3 villages to meet requirements - existing infrastructure is in place - counter intuitive to propose green belt sites or sites near to heathlands instead.
- Clear opportunity to ensure biodiversity net gain on the proposed site - deliverable immediately as there are no ownership complications.

Land off Salisbury Road, Pimperne (LA/PIMP/002 & LA/PIMP/003)

Savills on behalf of P and D Crocker

- Two land parcels off Salisbury Road, Pimperne are considered appropriate and sustainable locations for housing, which are not subject to heritage and ecological designations or in a flood risk area.
- The sites could deliver mix of about 25 market and affordable houses in the early part of the plan period. The sites are considered suitable because: they are adjacent to the settlement boundary; they are within walking and cycling distance of jobs, schools and services in the village with links to higher grade facilities in Blandford Forum; and vehicular and pedestrian access can be achieved, linking into the strategic road network (A354) and the wider pedestrian network subject.
- The sites have not been identified as a Preferred Option in the draft Local Plan and the SHLAA considers them to be unsuitable with potential for landscape and visual impacts on the Cranborne Chase AONB. However, the sites are well related to the built form and will be viewed in that context in the AONB landscape. Any visual impacts can be mitigated through design and boundary planting.

Land off Dean Lane, Sixpenny Handley (LA/SIXP/004)

Savills on behalf of the Trustees of MALF Pitt Rivers

- Promotion of land off Dean Lane, Sixpenny Handley.
- Site can sensitively deliver 40 dwellings whilst mitigating against any potential adverse impact on the surrounding environment.
- The proposed development is of a low density to preserve the existing setting of the surrounding area and character of built form in the village.
- A cluster of 1 ½ and single storey dwellings is located in the south eastern corner of the Site to break up the scale of the development.
- The proposed layout incorporates extensive landscaping to respect the amenity of nearby residential areas and mitigate potential adverse visual impact on the Cranborne Chase AONB.

- Concept sketch also proposes an area of central green space, community green space, and a play area.
- The proposed development is accessed from Dean Lane, with potential for an additional private drive access at Oakley Lane to the north.
- A possible footpath is located to the south of the Site, providing pedestrian access to Keats Meadow.
- Consider that the Site is located in a sustainable location for a mix of market and affordable housing.
- Reference to landscape and visual assessment carried out for the site.
- The report concludes that the proposed development will not have adverse effect upon the key characteristics of the Cranborne Chase AONB and the Dorset Downs and Cranborne Chase National Character Area.
- Reference to a preliminary review of access opportunities carried out for the site.
- Assessment recommends two options. A pedestrian footway can either be taken along the Dean Lane frontage subject to further work to assess the impacts upon root protection zones, or alternatively to the east of the Dean Lane tree screen connecting into Oakley Lane.

Land off The Orchard, Sixpenny Handley (LA/SIXP/005)

Savills on behalf of the Trustees of MALF Pitt Rivers

- Land off the Orchard, Sixpenny Handley - the Site is considered suitable to deliver 30 dwellings.
- The Site is a sustainable site and deliverable in the early part of the Local Plan period.
- An existing field access is located to the east of the Site, which provides access to Dean Lane via The Orchard.
- Mature trees and hedgerows line the northern and western boundaries, with a public footpath running alongside the northern boundary.
- The eastern and southern boundaries are shared with rear gardens of houses at The Orchard and Handley Park. These comprise boundary fencing, hedgerows and occasional mature trees.
- The low density of the proposed development is intended to preserve the existing setting of the surrounding area and character of built form in the village.
- Reference to submitted layout plan - indicates extensive landscaping across the Site, landscaping is intended to soften the impact of the development on the village edge, and impacts on the surrounding countryside.
- The proposed development is on a higher level than the existing residential development at The Orchard due to the topography of the land.
- Proposed landscaping will screen the development, thus protecting the residential amenity of the existing and proposed developments.
- Consider that The Site is located in a sustainable location for a mix of market and affordable housing.
- Reference to landscape and visual impact assessment carried out for the site - the Site has a limited visual envelope and is read in the context of existing residential development.
- The proposed development will not have an adverse effect upon the Cranborne Chase AONB and Dorset Downs and Cranborne Chase National Character Area.
- The proposed development is also considered to have a beneficial effect upon the Landscape and Townscape character.
- Reference to a preliminary review of the access opportunities for the Site that has been carried out – considers that a viable access can be achieved.

- Footway and cycleway connections across the Site (as indicated in Figure 3) are considered to maximise permeability, and shorten walking/cycling to key destination points in the village.

Land at Three Legged Cross (LA/VERW/024)

Developers/Landowners/Agents

- Respondent supports proposals to amend Green Belt boundaries in order to deliver new homes.
- Respondent promotes a site with capacity to deliver around 47 new homes and a 60 bed care home within the 400 metre area around a heathland habitat site.

Land at Jades Farm, Furzehill (LA/HOLT/002)

Chapman Lily Planning on behalf of WH White Ltd

- Land at Jades Farm, Furzehill is available, deliverable and developable, well served by public transport, performs well in sustainability terms. The site could provide 180-200 residential homes (including a proportion of affordable units), together with community facilities, such as a new village hall and play facilities, with potential for a SANG to the immediate north which would provide biodiversity improvements, as well as make a large area of land publicly accessible. The site would be a credible alternative to the Council's current preferred sites on the edge of Wimborne/Colehill and should be allocated as an omission site.

Land at E 389797 N 104244, Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall (LA/CMAR/002)

David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management

- Promotion of land at E 389797 N 104244, Bournemouth Road, Charlton Marshall.
- Site could deliver 70 dwellings, up to 28 dwellings (40%) of which will be affordable homes, including affordable rent with opportunity for a Community Land Trust (CLT) to take freehold ownership, as well as play space, link to the Dorset Trailway, an allotment/ community orchard, and open space network that includes habitat creation that will deliver a net gain in biodiversity.
- SHLAA identified the site ref LA/CMAR/002, as not constrained and suitable, subject to policy change.
- Suggestion that Charlton Marshall is an inherently sustainable location for growth due to the absence of designated constraints, proximate relationship with Blandford, and good connectivity.
- Questions the appropriateness of the three draft allocations at Sturminster Marshall which require release of Green Belt land.
- Suggestion that promoted land would align the Dorset Local Plan to paras 35, 68, and 137 of the NPPF.
- A planning application has been submitted for the site - currently subject to determination by the Planning Inspectorate.
- Site is deliverable within a 5-year period, and capable of positively contributing to meeting the housing requirements of the Dorset Local Plan in a sustainable location.
- Suggest that the Council need to undertake further evidenced consideration of the sustainable and deliverable growth opportunities on land outside of the Green Belt – in order to ensure the plan is sound.

Land at Worgret Manor Farm (LA/ARNE/004)

Mr A Baggs on behalf of A & F Baggs

- The respondent considers that the site could deliver around 500 new homes, open space, a new local centre, a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space and employment space.
- The respondent has gathered evidence on the following issues in support of the sites development:
 - Access – the respondents assessment indicates that traffic generated from the development would not have a severe impact on the three junctions on the A351 corridor. The respondent notes existing pedestrian links between the site and Wareham/its station.
 - Ecology – the site is not subject to any specific designations.
 - Historic environment/archaeology - the respondent notes the presence of a Grade II listed building on the site, but does not identify that it is affected by World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, registered parks or gardens, or registered battlefields within 1km of the site.
 - Landscape – the respondent considers that the site and receiving environment has the capacity to accommodate the proposed development.
- The respondent considers that Wareham in broad terms, and the site specifically, are sustainable locations for further development.

Land at Holton Gate, Holton Heath (LA/WASM/001 & LA/WASM/006)

Chapman Lily Planning on behalf of Birchmere Ltd

- Site should be allocated for employment uses.
- The site is well placed at the entrance to the established key employment site at Holton Heath and would provide new employment opportunities to serve the growing populations of both southeast Dorset and BCP, at the heart of the functional area.
- Designated cycle and footpaths arrive at the site frontage and it is also well connected to the Holton Heath railway station, which serves the Weymouth to Waterloo mainline.
- The site is in flood zone 1 and therefore at the lowest risk of fluvial or tidal flooding.
- There are no heritage assets onsite, though a scheduled ancient monument is located off-site.
- The site is not within the green belt.
- There are trees on site, but an arboricultural impact assessment shows the trees need not be a constraint to development.
- Technical assessments submitted in respect of heritage, biodiversity and flood risk demonstrate the deliverability in principle of development at the site.
- Development would not prejudice ecology, instead offering the opportunity to create linked habitats, as supported by Natural England.

Land to the north of Plumbley Meadows, Winterbourne Kingston (LA/WKIN/006)

AAH Planning Consultants

- Suggest that allocations should also support growth in rural areas to maintain their vitality, rural services and as part of a resilient housing land supply (typically rural sites tend to be smaller).

- The land owner has already demonstrated through an earlier planning application (P/OUT/2020/00414) how the Land to the North of Plumbley Meadows could deliver 20 new homes.
- The planning application was submitted with evidence (including Traffic Assessment Plan, Heritage Impact Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment, contamination report and 'Phase 1 Ecological Report') to demonstrate its suitability. The evidence demonstrates that there were no issues that would prevent the sites allocation for new homes.
- The respondent considers that residential development would be achievable (viable), that the site is available and that there are no legal issues relating to the Land to the north of Plumbley Meadows which might restrict development.

Land to the south of Bere Regis (LA/BERE/010)

Savills on behalf of the Bere Heath Estate

- The respondent considers that Bere Regis is a sustainable location for 'modest growth' through new homes citing its services/facilities, position outside (but on the edge) of the Green Belt, its relationship with Dorset Innovation Park and its connectivity by road/relationship with railway stations.
- The land to the south of Bere Regis is outside the 400 metre area defined around Dorset heaths habitat sites and does not extend into the open countryside.
- The respondent does not consider that new homes on the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape (citing a containing belt of trees and the sites visibility from the surrounding area [including the AONB]).
- The respondent suggests that the housing target for Bere Regis should be increased from 153 new homes to 200 new homes to reflect the village's location, suitability and sustainability.
- The respondent considers that new homes should be allocated through policies in the new local plan rather than the neighbourhood plan to enhance certainty and speed of delivery.

Land south of Sandford (LA/WASM/007)

Carter Jonas on behalf of Welbeck Land

- Site is largely flat.
- Its boundaries are enclosed with low hedges and there are a group of mature trees growing close to its north eastern edge.
- The site is in the green belt, but the emerging housing needs likely to be identified in the Dorset plan (including those from Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole) could provide a strong part of an exceptional circumstances case.
- The site is close to, but outside the 400-metre buffer, of a heath (designated as a European site), but as referenced above there is ample land available to deliver mitigation as necessary.

Land west of Clenston Road, Winterborne Stickland (LA/WSTI/001)

Planning Base Limited on behalf of the landowner

- Respondent suggests that the plan should include policy allocations for new homes in north Dorset villages to help support rural services and facilities.
- Policies which support selected housing allocations around Tier 3 villages will help to avoid unplanned speculative development.
- Winterborne Stickland is not constrained by the Green Belt or the requirements relating to habitat sites (the respondent specifically references Dorset heaths habitat sites).

Dorset Council Local Plan consultation 2021 summary of responses – South Eastern Dorset Functional Area

- The respondent considers that the sites to the west of Clenston Road represents a more sustainable option for development than some of those other sites presented in the emerging local plan.
- The respondent considers that his client's site is a more sustainable option for development than some of the proposed policy allocations which are affected by Green Belt, flood risk and are likely to have an effect of Dorset heaths habitat sites.
- The respondent considers that the site to the west of Clenston Road presents an opportunity to achieve a net gain in Biodiversity.
- The respondent states that new homes could be delivered immediately and that there are no ownership complications.