

Chesil Bank Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Plan Representation Summary

Chesil Bank Parish Council submitted the final version of the Chesil Bank Neighbourhood Plan (2022) to Dorset Council for independent examination in December 2022. The supporting Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) was subsequently updated in January 2023 to reference recreation at Chesil & The Fleet. People were given six weeks from 30 January 2023 until the end of Friday 3 March 2023 to comment on the content of the plan or how it was produced. At the close of the public consultation 14 representations were received.

Rep ID	Respondent	Summary
1	Anthea Spearing	<p>Policy CBNP6. Land adjoining Stone Cottage (FL-05)</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan was put forward before the now ongoing development of Gaolan woods on Fleet road. This is an area which will house many park homes which will be available to buy. Local residents are not in favour of this as the ancient woodland has been taken down and the beautiful area destroyed. I understand it this will continue to be developed despite being in an area of outstanding natural beauty and the objections by local residents. This development together with any further building in the area will only increase the noise and traffic along Fleet road and reduce the tranquillity of this beautiful hamlet.</p> <p>In light of this and the huge new housing development in Chickerell I feel any further affordable housing development in Fleet is not required. There are no pavements/ street lighting/shops etc. I am concerned that this may be the thin end of the wedge for further development and may actually cause residents to move out of the area rather than stay.</p>
2	Away Resorts Ltd (Avison Young)	<p>Background</p> <p>We write on behalf of our client, Away Resorts Ltd, who own and operate East Fleet Farm Holiday Park ('East Fleet'), located adjacent to the shores of the Fleet Lagoon in the south-western part of the neighbourhood plan area. The Park currently provides a total of 380 pitches for a mixture of touring caravan and camping purposes.</p> <p>4.2.1 (d) Objectives</p> <p>Our client welcomes the Plans intention to encourage the provision of leisure and recreational activities according to the various needs of the community. However, we are concerned that the objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan fail to recognise the importance of tourism in this area. The industry is referenced within the introduction to the plan, stating that it is one of the primary areas for employment and that the community benefits from the additional income generated by tourism in this location. Further recognition of Fleet as a "significant tourist destination" is set out at paragraph 2.2.15 but, the impact that tourism brings to the area is not distinguished. Alternative policy wording is supplied that is considered will better accord with Policy ECON5.</p> <p>Policy CBNP3. Holiday / Second Home Restrictions</p> <p>The second paragraph of this policy sets out that the Neighbourhood Plan will not support the development of any new built</p>

holiday accommodation in the settlements listed. The nature of the policy does not accord with both National (NPPF, Paragraph 84) and Local Planning Policy (Policy SUS2, criterion III). Alternative policy wording supplied.

[Policy CBNP10. Sustainable Business Growth](#)

Our client supports this policy of the Neighbourhood Plan which allows opportunities for new and expanding businesses in the wider countryside, including in and around Fleet, to be supported. The rural location of East Fleet is essential for the tourism business that it provides.

The existing premises at East Fleet has been in situ at this location for over 40 years and during August, can have up to 1,100 guests staying on-site at any one time. The proposed policy allows for its modernisation and improvement, ensuring that the site is able to support the tourism industry in this area in both the short and long term.

[Policy CBNP12. Community and Recreational Facilities](#)

Our client is glad to see that this policy seeks to support the provision of new facilities within or adjoining settlements including Fleet provided it can be accommodated without any unacceptable impact on the environment, local amenity and any resulting vehicular movements can be safely accommodated on the rural road network.

Whilst there is acknowledgement and reference to the tourism industry throughout the Neighbourhood Plan document, there is no formal recognition within any of the outlined policies which, given its importance in terms of local employment and the economic benefits it generates, ought to be rectified in the view of our client.

It is requested that ‘tourism’ should be added after ‘recreational’ to provide greater clarification that this type of development proposal would also be supported by the Neighbourhood Plan.

[Policy CBNP13. Recreational Access to the Countryside](#)

Our client would like to express their support for this policy which seeks the improvement and expansion of the existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network. There is a bridleway which runs through the site with a footpath (South-West Coastal Path) running along the western boundary adjacent to the coastline. Our client encourages these proposals and will assist the Parish in any feasible way in terms of any improvements/expansion/creation of a joined-up network in relation to the network which borders East Fleet.

[Policy CBNP16. Local Views](#)

Views along Chesil Beach and Fleet Lagoon has been identified as one of local significance. Any potential future development at the East Fleet holiday site is well screened by the existing hedging and planting as well as benefitting from the site’s topography. This will ensure that the views of Chesil Beach and the Fleet Lagoon can continue to be enjoyed.

Notwithstanding, our client confirms that should any further development come forward in the western part of the site during the life of the Neighbourhood Plan, then they would be happy to improve the landscaping screening of East Fleet within the parameters of this view.

		<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Our clients wish to see the parish thrive economically, environmentally and socially over the plan period to 2032. East Fleet Holiday Park can be of benefit to Chesil Bank Parish Council provided Neighbourhood Plan polices support the modernisation and improvement of holiday accommodation so that the site may continue to evolve to allow for the continued economic and social benefits that it brings to the local community.</p>
3	Chickerell Town Council	<p>Policy CBNP6. Land adjoining Stone Cottage (FL-05)</p> <p>Chickerell Neighbourhood Plan has sought to protect the Heritage Coast from development. The housing allocation at Fleet is contrary to CNPs approach, our residents views, Natural England advice and current Local Plan Policies.</p>
4	Dorset Police - Crime Prevention Design Advisor	<p>Paragraph 3.1.8</p> <p>Having reviewed the plan, it correctly states that the areas mentioned have low crime rates, however, with more people moving into the County of Dorset over the next 10 years we must not become complacent.</p> <p>Policy CBNP22. Chesil Bank Design Guidance</p> <p>It is clear to see from the document that any new homes that are built will be of a sustainable high quality design and be in keeping with the established character of the area.</p> <p>Security</p> <p>Unfortunately, there appears to be no mention of security especially Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act which places a clear and legal obligation on local authorities to consider crime prevention in every function they take including planning. National Planning Practice Guidance on Design reminds practitioners that local authorities are duty bound to adhere to this and do all they can to prevent crime and disorder. By improving safety, security and wellbeing of those who live and work in these areas is a major part to ensure sustainability and for people to live happily for years to come.</p> <p>Secured By Design (SBD)</p> <p>I would also like to bring to your attention Secured By Design (SBD) which is the official Police security initiative. I would strongly recommend that the security of any new dwelling or development meets the standards laid out in the SBD guidance. The environmental benefits of SBD are supported by academic research proving that SBD housing experience up to 87% less burglary, 25% less vehicle crime and 25% less criminal damage.</p> <p>Developers around the UK can receive SBD awards for incorporating crime prevention measures and techniques into their housing schemes. More information can be found at www.securedbydesign.com</p> <p>Ideally, the Police would like every new home to meet the security specifications set out by SBD.</p> <p>Design and Access statement</p> <p>I would also like to see the measures that have been taken to design out crime included in the Design and Access statement.</p>

		<p>Crime Prevention Design Advisor Dorset Police also encourages the Council to involve the Crime Prevention Design Advisor at the early stages of the process.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Dorset Council – Spatial Planning Including Engineer (Development Liaison) & Conservation</p>	<p>Plan Period The front cover confirms that the Plan period will cover the years 2022 – 2032, a ten-year time horizon.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Area Dorset Council supports section 1.2 and figure 1 which discusses and depicts the Neighbourhood Plan area, a requirement for submission.</p> <p>Housing Requirement Paragraph 5.1.1 and Table 2 of the Chesil Bank Neighbourhood Plan helpfully summarises the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan expectations for the delivery of future housing in the Chesil Bank area by its components. The Neighbourhood Plan group has, however, commissioned additional research into the needs of their community. The Chesil Bank Housing Needs Assessment (2021) concluded that it would be prudent to provide some additional housing sites to increase the housing provision over and above that which would come through windfall sites. As an update, the latest monitoring data for 1 April 2022 now indicates 11 commitments.</p> <p>Although the Neighbourhood Plan does not explicitly set out a housing need figure for the plan area, it is noted that none of the four proposed allocations, individually or cumulatively, would (if developed) be out of scale with the existing settlements in the plan area. For this reason, no concerns are raised regarding the proposed housing requirement (considered to be in general conformity with the adopted local plan) or the scale of development set out in this draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy CBNP1. Dwelling Types The policy is in general conformity with Policy HOUS3 Open Market Housing Mix and Policy HOUS1 Affordable Housing.</p> <p>Policy CBNP2. Dwelling extensions Dorset Council is concerned that the proposed approach is unnecessarily restrictive even with the justified exceptions. It is considered that homeowners should be allowed to extend their homes beyond what is allowed under Permitted Development rights subject to it being acceptable in terms of character and amenity, living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties etc.</p> <p>It is also noted that this policy seemingly conflicts with the aspiration and wording of Policy CBNP11. Homeworking which supports home working opportunities.</p> <p>This policy is not considered to be in generally conformity with Policy ENV15 and Policy SUS2, criterion iii)</p> <p>It is noted that a similarly worded Policy was proposed in the recently made Charmouth Neighbourhood Plan and was recommended for deletion in that instance.</p> <p>Policy CBNP3. Holiday / second home restrictions Given the level of usual residents / second homes in Chesil Bank it seems comparable to Charmouth where the examiner</p>

	<p>found the evidence to be compelling, Dorset Council would not seek to object to the proposed policy. The wording of the policy largely aligns with the made Charmouth Neighbourhood Plan Policy H3 with no concerns raised.</p> <p>Policy CBNP4. Affordable Housing – Local Connection</p> <p>Draft policy CBNP4 is considered to be in general conformity with Policies HOUS1 and HOUS2 and reflects the agreed Dorset Council approach to housing allocations as set out in the Dorset Housing Allocations Policy.</p> <p>Policy CBNP5. Land east of North Mead Farm (PO03)</p> <p>Draft policy CBNP5 seeks to address the constraints identified through appropriate policy criteria. Policy CBNP5 is also considered to be in general conformity with Policy SUS2.</p> <p>The supporting text states “it would be appropriate to require 50% of the new homes to be affordable.” It is not clear why a higher percentage requirement has not been set? Nevertheless, Policy CBNP5 is considered to be in general conformity with Policy HOUS2.</p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer has previously advised. The AECOM site assessment (Apr 2021, p. 25) and the explanatory text in the NP (p. 21) make it clear that development on this site is only going to be suitable towards the W end, where it is closer to the existing built-form, but also at the lower part of the site, which slopes up to the E. However, the policy text does not make any reference to this restriction. In general, and to guard against any unsuitable larger development proposal which could seek to fill the whole allocated site, I would suggest that: i) the site is reduced from its current extent to an area at the W end of the site which is considered suitable; or ii) the text is amended to state specifically that the allocation is for a small number of dwellings positioned at the W end of the site.</p> <p>The Council’s Engineer (Development Liaison) at Dorset Council has previously advised. Site 1: Likely to be ok given the highway in the vicinity and the access position also it is an extension to an existing recent cul-de-sac development.</p> <p>Policy CBNP6. Land adjoining Stone Cottage (FL-05)</p> <p>Dorset Council has some general concerns that the site doesn’t benefit from any natural boundaries or hedgerows as it sits within a larger agricultural field. Consequently, great care will need to be taken to ensure that the site integrates into its surroundings by providing substantial planting along the site’s boundary.</p> <p>The Council’s Conservation Officer has previously advised. It does not seem to have been flagged in the site assessment, but this site (and the whole field) is situated on an area of recorded medieval strip lynchets (Dorset HER ref: MDO1116).</p> <p>The policy has now been updated to require an archaeological evaluation.</p> <p>The Council’s Engineer (Development Liaison) at Dorset Council has previously advised. Site 2: Appropriate Vehicular Visibility designed to the speed of the road will be required, trimming of hedges to the north and south of the access will likely be required. Also there appears to be a large tree within the highway verge immediately to the south of the proposed access, it is highly likely this will need to be removed to accommodate the required vehicular visibility.</p> <p>The Consultation Statement addresses this point by stating that the tree came down in a storm.</p>
--	--

[Policy CBNP7. Land at Higher Farmhouse \(LH-01\)](#)

The site assessment AECOM report concludes that this site is potentially suitable; however, access is a considerable constraint and advice would be needed from a highways officer to understand whether this site could be made suitable.”

The Council’s Engineer (Development Liaison) at Dorset Council has previously advised. Site 3: Given the quantum and nature of highway in the vicinity of the site, it’s unlikely the Highway Authority would object.

The Council’s Conservation Officer previously advised. Again, I cannot see this mentioned in the evidence base, but the site is on an area of recorded earthworks relating to part of the shrunken settlement of Langton, most likely it is on or around the site of the medieval manor house (Dorset HER ref: MDO1327).

The policy has been updated to require an archaeological evaluation.

The policy text proposes only a single dwelling in this location and is considered appropriate. The proposed site allocation is considered to be in general conformity with Policy SUS2.

[Policy CBNP8. Land adjoining 4 Court Close \(LH-02\)](#)

Draft Policy CBNP8 allocates the site for one dwelling and supporting text and policy criterion set out appropriate design and heritage expectations. The requirement for a drainage scheme is also appropriate. The proposed site allocation is considered to be in general conformity with Policy SUS2.

The Council’s Conservation Officer has previously suggested a minor change to the wording in criterion 3 of the policy.

The inclusion of this text is welcomed.

The Council’s Engineer (Development Liaison) at Dorset Council has previously advised. Site 4: Given the quantum and nature of highway in the vicinity of the site, it’s unlikely the Highway Authority would object.

[Policy CBNP9. Ensuring Nutrient Neutrality](#)

The HRA is clear that, it is also necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to contain a sufficient policy framework to ensure planning applications for the allocated sites can demonstrate they can achieve nutrient neutrality through mitigation if necessary.

Paragraph 5.25 concludes with a policy wording recommendation to cover the newly identified issue of nutrient neutrality for Chesil & The Fleet SAC/SPA: This wording has been incorporated in full within Policy CBNP9.

With that requirement in place, it is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan will contain a sufficient policy framework to protect the SAC/SPA from nutrient pollution.

The Council have set up a specific webpage. [Nutrient Neutrality - Dorset Council](#)

[Policy CBNP10. Sustainable Business Growth](#)

The settlements of Abbotsbury, Portesham and Langton Herring are relatively well defined however some concern is raised with listing Fleet as a location because of its dispersed settlement pattern. Dorset Council is still supportive of rural employment where appropriate and would instead suggest that employment development in Fleet is considered under a

	<p>separate rural employment criterion.</p> <p>Policy ECON6 supports new built tourism accommodation in established settlements of more than 200 population. Locally, these are the settlements of Portesham and Abbotsbury. Policy ECON6 is not considered strategic and therefore a locally derived policy can be supported. It would however be helpful if the supporting text could clarify the reduced role of Abbotsbury.</p> <p>Criterion 3 sets out clear design expectation for all new employment development and is appropriate.</p> <p>Policy CBNP11. Homeworking</p> <p>Existing permitted development rights are outlined.</p> <p>If a specific policy is still considered appropriate, it is recommended that further criteria are added to the policy to reflect the plan area’s location in the Dorset AONB and Heritage Coast and exceptional landscape quality.</p> <p>Further alignment with Permitted Development rights could also be helpful, such as noting the Class E restriction on outbuildings beyond 20 meters of the dwellinghouse, that seeks to protect the AONBs landscape quality from excessively sized out buildings in larger curtilages.</p> <p>Policy CBNP12. Community and recreational facilities</p> <p>The Strategic Approach set out in the Local Plan states that community facilities should be provided within local communities, recognising the benefit of reducing car travel.</p> <p>The draft policy achieves these aims and can be supported although there is some uncertainty on the central location of Fleet which has a dispersed settlement pattern.</p> <p>The final paragraph requires applicants to engage in early discussions with the Parish Council where a change, closure or expansion is anticipated. While this objective is supported, it is recommended that this requirement forms part of the supporting text to the policy rather than policy itself as it reads as an ‘action’ rather than a policy criterion.</p> <p>Policy CBNP13. Recreational access to the countryside</p> <p>Policy CBNP13 is considered to fulfil the strategic approach and to be in general conformity with Policy COM7 criterion v). The policy also has due regards to national policy.</p> <p>Policy CBNP14. Local Green Spaces</p> <p>The policy text reflects National Policy and is supported.</p> <p>Proposed Local Green Spaces</p> <p>Table 3 and the supporting proposals map identify 18 Local Green Spaces largely clustered around the settlements of Abbotsbury, Portesham, Langton Herring and Fleet.</p> <p>All proposed sites are within close proximity to the communities they serve. The Portesham Playing Field and allotments, West Elworth are perhaps the most isolated Local Green Spaces however they are located only a short drive from both</p>
--	--

	<p>Portesham and Abbotsbury and are clearly of local value.</p> <p>The Old Railway Track between Abbotsbury and Portesham is the largest tract of land and is largely linear in nature. Planning practice guidance advises that there is no need to designate linear corridors as Local Green Space simply to protect rights of way, which are already protected under other legislation.</p> <p>The supporting justification for the line’s designation argues that although the space is a publicly accessible bridleway it also used for recreation and holds a wildlife and heritage value, as well as views of the ridgeway and local landscape. We agree that the route provides multiple aspects of local value and is appropriate for designation.</p> <p>Policy CBNP15. Local Landscape Features</p> <p>The drafted policy is considered to be in general conformity with Policy ENV1.</p> <p>Policy CBNP16. Local Views</p> <p>Public consultation has identified nine important views, listed in paragraph 8.4.1, described in Table 5 and identified on the policies map using a blue triangle.</p> <p>Although many of the views are expansive, they are all considered characteristic of the dramatic landscape of the World Heritage Coastline. Several of the views identify specific landmarks including St Catherine’s Chapel Abbotsbury, Hardy’s Monument and Tithe Barn – Abbotsbury which make them easier to interpret.</p> <p>Any views for inclusion within a policy should be clearly defined on the proposals map with the Council preferring a ‘splay’ symbol.</p> <p>Policy CBNP17. Dark Skies and Lighting Schemes</p> <p>Policy CBNP17 is considered to be in general conformity with Policy ENV16.</p> <p>Policy CBNP18. Local Wildlife and Habitats</p> <p>Policy CBNP18. has been prepared in general accordance with Local Plan policy ENV2 and has due regards to National Policy.</p> <p>Policy CBNP19. Local Heritage Features</p> <p>The scale of the proposals map makes it difficult to determine if all non-designated heritage assets have been mapped? It is recommended that a set of more detailed maps are prepared, and Dorset Council is happy to assist.</p> <p>Policy CBNP19. has been prepared in general accordance with Local Plan Policy ENV4 and has due regard to National Policy.</p> <p>Policy CBNP20. Local Flood Risk in Portesham</p> <p>Given that much of the village of Portesham is at risk of surface water flooding, and the recent triggering of a Flood Investigation Report (October 2019) into the 19 January 2019 event, it is agreed that there is sufficient local evidence to justify a more localised approach for the requirement of a SFRA in the area defined on the proposals map.</p> <p>The Portesham Flood Investigation Report fdrttdtrdrdrdt (dorsetcouncil.gov.uk)</p> <p>Policy CBNP21. Portesham’s Development Boundary</p>
--	--

		<p>Dorset Council is supportive of communities who wish to update and amend their defined development boundary and in this regard the changes to the DDB through Policy CBNP21. are supported as they do not undermine the overall objective of the DDB in this location.</p> <p>It is noted that there is no intention to amend the DDB around the CBNP5 allocation or to add a DDB around the other villages in the Plan. With regards to the CBNP5 allocation, Dorset Council agrees that the allocation should not be included within the DDB if it is to be developed entirely or mainly for affordable housing. However, allocations that are mainly for market housing should normally be included within a DDB/settlement boundary (SB) when they are adjacent to an existing DDB/SB.</p> <p>Policy CBNP22. Chesil Bank Design Guidance</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan does not have a specific policy of Design Codes however collectively policies ENV11, 12 & 13 provide a local framework for good design.</p> <p>The Chesil Bank Neighbourhood Plan Design Codes, July 2021 have been prepared in line with the latest Government guidance on Design Codes and will be a good reference source for local design guidance.</p> <p>Policies CBNP23 – 31 Design Policies</p> <p>Policies CBNP23-31 act as a set of design policies. No concerns are raised.</p> <p>Implementation and monitoring of the plan</p> <p>Dorset Council welcomes the Parish Council’s intention to review the Plan following the adoption of the Dorset Council Local Plan or in light of any national policy / legislative changes.</p> <p>Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)</p> <p>Policy wording recommendation has been made to cover recreational pressure for Chesil & The Fleet SAC/SPA</p> <p>The HRA recommends that Policy CBNP18 should make specific reference to the need for net new residential dwellings within the Neighbourhood Area to make a financial contribution to delivery of the Chesil & The Fleet Interim Recreation Mitigation Strategy, in line with Dorset Council guidance.</p> <p>Dorset Council supports the inclusion of the recommended text to Policy CBNP18 in order to ensure the making of the neighbourhood plan is compatible with and does not breach European Union obligations (under retained EU law).</p>
6	Environment Agency	<p>Our comments as set out in our previous response dated 21 June 2022 (our ref: WX/2020/134061/OR-04/IS1-L01) remain relevant. In particular those in relation to allocation LH-02.</p> <p>Housing allocations and Policy CBNP8. Land adjoining 4 Court Close (LH-02)</p> <p>The plan includes allocations which are located in areas at increased risk of surface water flooding. We have concerns in relation to these proposed housing allocations, in particular LH-02, however some other allocations are also affected to a lesser degree. We do note there is reference to a surface water drainage system that is not incorporated into the current surface water flood mapping in this area.</p>

		<p>In accordance with NPPF para 155-160, we remind you that the Sequential Test should be undertaken if the plan is proposing development or promoting growth to ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk taking climate change into account. The application of the Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authority’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p>It is important that your Plan also considers whether the flood risk issues associated with any proposed development can be safely managed to ensure development can come forward. Without this understanding your Plan is unlikely to complaint with the NPPF.</p>
7	Geoff Taylor	<p>Policy CBNP6. Land adjoining Stone Cottage (FL-05)</p> <p>Why is the only land suggested for development in the village of Fleet owned by a member of the CBNP steering Group, that drew up the plan?</p> <p>To build here does not seem to be in accordance with “The West Dorset Local Plan” or the first draft “New Dorset plan”. English Nature would not normally support this sort of application.</p> <p>The proposal does not meet sustainability requirements, Fleet does not have a village centre, also no footpaths, no local school, no shops, no streetlights, the only utility services are electric, water and a very poor phone/broadband service. Fleet is not the most suitable place for affordable housing.</p> <p>The proposed sighting would make it quite an eyesore located almost in the middle of the field on quite a steep gradient. The area defined in the AECOM report (2021) suggests possible future development of the site for one dwelling! It should only show sufficient area for one property. The same statement would apply to the ground area shown in the draft plan under FL-05. Not as put forward an area that would accommodate four or five properties.</p> <p>Although not strictly in Fleet the land by the roundabout at the top of Fleet Road has been refused planning permission on application and appeal (and that location would have ready access to all utilities)</p> <p>If one was going to build a new house on the land at Stone Cottage it would make more sense to place it adjacent to the existing property or as near as possible to the access point onto Fleet Road, the ground is not so steep there (was also suggested by AECOM) i.e., adjacent to the Southern boundary.</p>
8	Gloucestershire CC – Minerals & Waste Team	No comment.
9	Highways England	<p>Introduction</p> <p>We note that the Plan area includes the Parishes of Abbotsbury, Fleet, Langton Herring and Portesham. National Highways is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the</p>

		<p>A35 trunk road which passes some distance to the north of the Plan area.</p> <p>Having reviewed the Plan we are satisfied that the Plan’s proposed policies are unlikely to lead to a scale of development that will adversely impact the on the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network and we therefore have no comments to make.</p> <p>Future engagement</p> <p>These comments do not prejudice any future responses National Highways may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.</p>
10	Historic England	<p>We are pleased to see that our previous comments concerning archaeology at sites 1,2,3,5 and 6 have been addressed and that the plan has been updated to further protect heritage assets, as development comes forward. We have no further comments to make at this point in time.</p>
11	Ian Gardner	<p>Policy CBNP6. Land adjoining Stone Cottage (FL-05)</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans are required to conform with National Planning Policy and Local Plan Policy. The current policies are detailed in the 2015 West Dorset, W&P Local Plan. There was also a WD and W&P Local Plan Review Preferred Options Consultation document of August 2018 which did not seem to be proposing relaxations of the policies relating to the Heritage Coast, AONB etc.</p> <p>The Fleet is the largest example of a lagoon habitat in England and together with Chesil Bank is subject to three international designations (RAMSAR, SAC and SPA). Much of the area received Heritage Coast designation in 1983, and the South West Coast Path following the inner edge of the tidal lagoon is a major recreation destination. The land between the coast and the B3157 Coast Road is particularly environmentally sensitive.</p> <p>ENV1 of the 2015 LP seeks to protect the Heritage Coast and AONB from development. The proposed ENV1 detailed in the 2018 document seems to suggest tighter controls e.g., ‘developments in the AONB will be refused unless it can be demonstrated it is in the national interest’.</p> <p>ENV2 of the 2015 LP (and ENV3 of the 2018 review) affords protection of the Fleet RAMSAR site (International protection status) and its hinterland from development.</p> <p>Para 2.2.12 of the 2015 LP refers to The Fleet and its protection as a wildlife site needing to be given great weight in planning decisions. The Chesil Bank and Fleet Nature Reserve 2020 Report refer to the area being under increased threat from disturbance advising of a risk some areas will become completely devoid of wildlife. More homes, of course, may increase disturbance and more resident cats and dogs. Compromises or mitigation may be suggested but mitigation is unlikely to actually reverse the decline in the habitat or its wildlife.</p> <p>P 2.2.7 of the NP refers to the fact that a large number of residents (of Chickerell) walk through the village and use the coastal footpath. That path is popular with local dog walkers which brings problems as wildlife is disturbed along the shores of the Fleet and in adjoining open fields. Although a RAMSAR site many walkers/dogs leave the footpath and enter The Fleet</p>

		<p>disturbing wildlife.</p> <p>91% of local residents who responded to Chickerell’s NP questionnaire agreed that new buildings and structures on the Heritage Coast should be discouraged. Numerous responses commented that the area to the Fleet should be protected not just for the internationally renowned status of its landscape and wildlife but because of its tranquillity and recreational benefits. No development on the Coastal side of the B3157 next to Fleet was wanted. The Chickerell NP approach was supported by the Government Inspector who examined their NP.</p> <p>Fleet does not have a defined DDB. Policy SUS2 of the 2015 LP states ‘outside defined development boundaries development will be strictly controlled having particular regard to the need to protect the countryside and environmental constraints’. There are some exceptions which may permit development however they do not allow new open market housing.</p> <p>For many decades the Local Planning Authority has not approved any new residential development in Fleet. (Extensions to existing buildings and replacements on a one for one basis have been permitted in line with LP polices.) Sites for new residential properties in Fleet would conflict with Local Plan Policy ENV1.</p> <p>Note. an Inspector has turned down an Appeal against WDDC’s refusal of a house on the borders of Fleet Parish citing the importance of the area. He argued residential development would cause undue harm to the appearance of the surrounding rural landscape and have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character of the Heritage Coast. If sites were allocated in Fleet, developers would argue that if it is OK to build one house without damaging the environment why not more? Note the size of the proposed allocation.</p> <p>Fleet has little if any infrastructure and residents have to go to or through Chickerell to access shops and its schools. Adjacent Chickerell has grown, and is planned to grow significantly with some one of the new homes being affordable which arguably would be able to meet Fleet housing needs.</p> <p>Natural England objected to new development proposed in Fleet and even to one property in Chickerell on the border of Fleet at the top of Fleet Road. A subsequent Appeal in respect of that latter PA was rejected.</p> <p>Fleet sites do not meet the LPA’s sustainability criteria. There is no safe route to school (taxis have had to provide school transport). Camp site and other tourist traffic is a problem for walkers. Installation of a paved footway would have an adverse effect on the valued rural nature of the Village in the Heritage Coast.</p> <p>Concerns have been expressed that the proposed Stone Cottage site seems large given the ‘preferably be limited to 3 Bedrooms’. Might an owner seek to build more once the principle of some development was accepted? Would it be mandated that a Housing Association should be involved to ensure that ‘affordability’ would be in perpetuity? However, the main issue is that any new development in Fleet would be contrary to policy, the advice of Natural England and to the detriment of the Heritage Coast and its wildlife.</p>
12	Martin Foley	<p>Personal Statement</p> <p>I have lived in Fleet since 1995. I am a local full time commercial fisherman for almost 40 years. Times in the fishing industry have, along with many other occupations, been particularly difficult during the last few years.</p>

		<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>I have always been under the impression that there would be no more development in Fleet and was surprised to hear that some large sites had been assessed as possible development, under supposedly “affordable homes”. I have two sons and the only way they could remain living in the village would be in a small discrete affordable house built within the confines of my property (not on agricultural land, woods etc).</p> <p>Call for sites / Omission site</p> <p>In May 2022 when the display of the NP consultation was at Fleet church, I was advised (Email dated 26 May 2022 attached) to complete a survey raising that I had a potential plot of land. Since that time, I heard no more until December 2022 when I saw the CBNP had been submitted. There was no mention of my comments about having a plot for consideration, only that a site in Portesham could be a potential plot. I raised my concerns with the steering group in February 2023 and received a response (Email dated 13 February 2023) that if they tried to introduce a change at this late stage it would be disruptive to the process.</p>
13	National Grid (Avison Young)	<p>National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid’s core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood area. Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure.</p>
14	Sport England	<p>Sports England refer to National Policy and their statutory role in protecting playing fields. Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and the need for robust and up to date evidence. If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with their design guidance notes. Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity.</p>