

Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan

Responses to the Regulation 16 consultation

The Regulation 16 consultation was held between 10 November and 22 December 2023 (6 weeks). Ten responses were received during this time, as detailed in the table below.

No.	Name	Organisation	Date submitted
1	S Tonkin	Cranborne Chase AONB	21 Nov 2023
2	G Gallacher	National Highways	27 Nov 2023
3	J Hawkins	Gillingham Town Council	13 Dec 2023
4	S Wintle	Natural England	20 Dec 2023
5	D Stuart	Historic England	21 Dec 2023
6	L Fello	Environment Agency	22 Dec 2023
7	J Sledge	Resident	22 Nov 2023
8	P Talbot	Resident	16 Dec 2023
9	R Hannam	Resident	19 Dec 2023
10	P Reese	Dorset Council	22 Dec 2023

Representation number: 1

From: Steve Tonkin, Dark Skies Advisor

Organisation: Cranborne Chase AONB

Submitted: 21 November 2023

Comments:-

The Dark Skies statements in the plan are very welcome, but do not go far enough.

The PIR motion detector "on" time needs to be limited.

There is no mention of light emission from internal sources via roof lights and extensively glazed elevations.

There is no mention of the height of walkway lighting.

Given the state of knowledge on the importance of lowering correlated colour temperature (CCT) in order to reduce atmospheric scatter, blue light hazard (especially to invertebrates) and melatonin dysregulation, it would be prudent to limit CCT to 2700K. (see, for example, https://britastro.org/dark-skies/pdfs/Blue_light_and_living_things.pdf; <https://travislongcore.net/2018/06/12/new-paper-picking-spectrum-to-reduce-adverse-effects-of-lights-on-wildlife/>)

We would welcome amended and additional statements of policy under POLICY BWKM 5 - LIGHTING SCHEMES as follows:

- d) Movement sensitive and timed PIR lights, downlighters or 'wall washers' are examples of lighting schemes that generally have less adverse impact whilst providing appropriate illumination. PIR motion sensors should have a maximum "on" time of 5 minutes.
- e) Any proposals and designs that include roof lights, lantern lights, and/or floor to eaves and floor to gable glazing, will not be supported in new build, refurbishment, and extension projects, unless integral blinds or louvres or external 'brise soleil' fixed louvres, are provided as mitigation.
- f) All such blinds and/or louvered units that are not easily accessible, must be provided with automatically operated, light sensor systems, to ensure closure at dusk.
- g) All ground-based lighting units to mark pedestrian paths and similar areas shall be located no higher than 1 metre above ground level and all wall mounted lighting units shall be located as low as practicable and shielded to prevent upward emission of light.
- h) External lighting shall have a maximum correlated colour temperature (CCT) of 2700K.

Representation number: 2

From: Gaynor Gallacher, Assistant Spatial Planner (Highways Development Management)

Organisation: National Highways

Submitted: 27 November 2023

Comments:-

Thank you for providing National Highways with the opportunity to comment on the submission version of the neighbourhood plan for the parishes of Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna. National Highways is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the A303 which passes some distance to the north of the plan area. Connections are provided to the A303 via a number of local routes, most directly to the north at Wincanton.

Having reviewed the submitted plan we consider that the plan's proposed policies are unlikely to result in a scale of development which will adversely impact the safe and efficient operation of SRN, and we therefore have no comments to make.

Please note however that this does not prejudice any future responses National Highways may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.

Representation number: 3

From: Julie Hawkins, Town Clerk

Organisation: Gillingham Town Council

Submitted: 13 December 2023

Comments:-

I write to confirm that the Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan 2021 to 2038 was considered by Gillingham Town Council at a Full Council meeting held on 11 December 2023. Gillingham Town Council agreed and resolved to support the plan.

Representation number: 4

From: Sally Wintle, Consultations Team

Organisation: Natural England

Submitted: 20 December 2023

Comments:-

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.

<full submission starts on next page>

Date: 20 December 2023
Our ref: 456356
Your ref: Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan



Mr Philip Reese
Dorset Council

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

BY EMAIL ONLY

NeighbourhoodPlanning@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Mr Reese

Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 Consultation

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 10 November 2023.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.

Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in [Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species](#).

Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission [standing advice](#).

We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.

Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.

For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely
Sally Wintle
Consultations Team

Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities

Natural environment information sources

The [Magic](#)¹ website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: **Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones)**. Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available from [the Association of Local Environmental Records Centres](#) .

Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found [here](#)². Most of these will be mapped either as **Sites of Special Scientific Interest**, on the Magic website or as **Local Wildlife Sites**. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.

National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found [here](#)³.

There may also be a local **landscape character assessment** covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.

If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a **National Park** or **Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty** (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.

General mapped information on **soil types** and **Agricultural Land Classification** is available (under 'landscape') on the [Magic](#)⁴ website and also from the [LandIS website](#)⁵, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.

Natural environment issues to consider

The [National Planning Policy Framework](#)⁶ sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. [Planning Practice Guidance](#)⁷ sets out supporting guidance.

Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.

Landscape

Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.

If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.

¹ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making>

⁴ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

⁵ <http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm>

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

⁷ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/>

Wildlife habitats

Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed [here](#)⁸), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or [Ancient woodland](#)⁹. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.

Priority and protected species

You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed [here](#)¹⁰) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice [here](#)¹¹ to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.

Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 112. For more information, see [Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land](#)¹².

Improving your natural environment

Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment and should provide net gains for biodiversity in line with the [National Planning Policy Framework](#). If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you should follow the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy and seek to ensure impacts on habitats are avoided or minimised before considering opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. You may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development and how these could contribute to biodiversity net gain and wider environmental goals.

Opportunities for environmental enhancement might include:

- Restoring a neglected hedgerow.
- Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.
- Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.
- Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.
- Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.
- Think about how lighting can be best managed to reduce impacts on wildlife.
- Adding a green roof to new buildings.
- Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.

[Defra's Biodiversity Metric](#) should be used to understand the baseline biodiversity value of proposed development sites and may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains where detailed site development proposals are known. For small development sites the [Small Sites Metric](#) may be used. This is a simplified version of [Defra's Biodiversity Metric](#) and is designed for use where certain criteria are met.

Where on site measures for biodiversity net gain are not possible, you should consider off site measures.

You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:

- Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community.
- Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision. Natural England's [Green Infrastructure Framework](#) sets out further information on green infrastructure standards and principles
- Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see [Planning Practice Guidance](#)¹³).

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals>

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land>

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space>

- Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks or on verges, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).
- Planting additional street trees.
- Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.
- Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore).

Natural England's [Environmental Benefits from Nature tool](#) may be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature and to avoid and minimise any negative impacts. It is designed to work alongside [Defra's Biodiversity Metric](#) and is available as a beta test version.

Representation number: 5

From: David Stuart, Historic Places Adviser

Organisation: Historic England

Submitted: 21 December 2023

Comments:-

Thank you for your Regulation 16 consultation on the submitted version of the Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan.

I can confirm that there are no issues associated with the Plan upon which we wish to comment.

Representation number: 6

From: Lindsay Fello, Planning Advisor

Organisation: Environment Agency

Submitted: 22 December 2023

Comments:-

Thank you for consulting us on Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 16 consultation, we have no further comments to make.

Representation number: 7

From: Mrs J Sledge, resident of Buckhorn Weston

Submitted: 22 November 2023

Comments:-

I basically support the plan because, while wanting to keep the rural feel of Buckhorn Weston, I do not want it to become only populated by a wealthy and increasingly aging population. At present it has a variety of activities for all age groups and varying affluence and I want it to stay that way - had I wanted to end up living in a retirement village I wouldn't have chosen to live here.

We have one brown field site in Buckhorn Weston which is getting overgrown and attracting vermin and we really need this to be developed.

Representation number: 8

From: Mr P Talbot, resident of Kington Magna

Submitted: 16 December 2023

Comments:-

I would question the restriction to limit responses to documents and plans to one per household. This would seem to restrict the rights of members of households with more than one occupier where differing views may be held.

In principal i am not against the concept of a Neighborhood plan. What I do struggle with is the concept where a group of councillors supported with government funding and backed by Planning consultants can basically produce a document with the minimum of consultation with the residents.

There has been open formal meeting dedicated solely to informing residents on the implications of the Plan and how it supports the initial public aims for over 12 months.

When legitimate questions are asked the PC refuse to answer.

Spread sheet data from early consultations is made available but the consolidated documents summarising the information (produced by the consultants) is hidden from public view.

When comments are asked for on the draft plan the responses are frozen in a document and sent to the County Council. There is no interaction to determine if the response satisfies the resident before issuing.

All the above I believe has resulted in a document that fails to build on the aims originally set out by the residents namely limited development of affordable houses for local people Whilst maintaining the village character with open green spaces. If one looks at the number of responses to the draft plan it seems the document has failed to inspire the residents in any way.

I have attached a file hopefully evidencing the above comments including interactions earlier in the year with the County Council planning department.

The attachment also includes area's where I think the document could be improved/clarified .

<attachment starts on next page>

Please find below comments on the Buckhorn Weston/Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan Issue 14 Final

Introduction

Reference NP Steering Group mtg minutes dated 16th August 2023 (Note this meeting was held some three and a half weeks after the close of public comments on the draft NP)

RS (Steering Group) commented on the response from Public Health England that “could a proportion of homes be protected for existing village residents that would be accessible to both young people and families”. FB (Steering Group) responded that with the small amount, if any, of development we would not be in a position where we could reserve properties for villagers. RS felt that this would only be possible on a large development where the developer would have to allocate some of the housing to local people as part of the planning conditions, BW & KM have not allocated any sites of a size where this would be possible but the SG acknowledged their comments. The SG acknowledged the positive nature of the responses from the community.

I have included this statement as the original 3 ideas that gained the most popular response from the original public surveys were **Limited development of Affordable Housing for Local People**

Ref Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan Survey –

On Reviewing the NP document it seems that none of the original aims are addressed in the issue that has been submitted to the Council.

Where this change in policy was agreed is unclear but (In my opinion) reflects on the lack of any opportunities for collective public debate during this whole process.

Surely there was a clear justification for a public presentation before the document was uplifted to the council!

The last public open presentation I believe was the Site Boundary presentation held in Kington Magna 22 Oct 2022

In the early days of the process Verbal statements were made that promised/advised that the point of a neighbourhood plan was to give a degree of control to the village residents over areas for development, areas for industry areas for recreation and areas of protected green spaces etc. The document provides no clarity for where development can take place, other than an unlimited number positioned as infill in gardens. The document even fails to provide any outline proposal for development on the one Brown field site highlighted (Ex Cross Garage).

Promotion of local industry and areas for recreation are not mentioned. Green spaces have now been re-defined as recommended as important gaps, but there is no clarity as to what this term means.

Whilst it is true to say that the steering group meeting minutes are available on line it is also true that any questions asked of a steering group member are met with a negative response including a reference to having signed some form of confidentiality agreement.

You will be aware that I wrote to you in June outlining my frustration at trying to clarify with the Parish Council the actual meaning of the Neighbourhood plan and their complete stonewalling of providing any answers (Bearing in mind this is a document the PC requested residents comment on)

There is an attachment to the uploaded NP Document (Ref APL.BW.013.B Consultation Report 24.10.23). Within this document is the following response to the questions I sent you

4. (o134) The document discusses complex issues for which we have sought further clarification. The Parish Council have refused, in writing, to answer any clarifying questions to enable us to make a constructive decision. We therefore deem it best for the village to remain unchanged. 15.
5. Response – The respondent has requested ‘clarification’ amounting to a request for a general education on the planning system so that they feel better able to respond to the plan’s proposals. It is not the function of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group or Parish Council to provide general planning education for those consulted on proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan. Several surveys, public meetings and papers sent out for consultation have provided an opportunity for engagement throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. The comment is noted.

Attached is a further copy of the questions I originally sent to you and to which you kindly and promptly responded to questions within your area of influence. I will leave it up to you decide if the Parish Councils response is a genuine attempt to avoid scrutiny or do the remaining questions, as seem to be suggested, fall within your area of responsibility as a Planning Manager.

Summary

Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood plan issue 14 fails to address the original promises and expectations of the residents.

This come about in part due to the lack of public meetings where residents can fully question/understand and where necessary understand where expectations will not be fully satisfied.

No public meeting was held to go through the public comments on the final issue document. The Parish Council responses were published and issued to the County Council at the same time.

Government funded documents (Produced by consultants) consolidating the results of residents surveys have not been made public until months after the original issue date and only then when requested by residents

Residents putting questions to village representative of the PC NP Steering group are met with a negative response of “I have signed a document of confidentiality”.

Residents putting written questions to the Parish Council are met with a hostile and negative response even though the Parish Council have requested comments on the document

The plan lacks a clear statement with respect to the impact (If any) on the Kington Magna Conservation area

The plan lacks even an outline proposal as to the future plans for development of the Cross Garage site.

There is no management section outlining how the NP would be managed should it be adopted.

Looking at the numbers of comments to the Final Issue document there could be a suggestion that there is an overall lack of interest in having a Neighbourhood plan at all.

Attchments

- 1) E mail questions to Phillip Reese dated 10 July 2023
- 2) E mail questions to Philip Reese dated 11July 2023
- 3) E mail Copy of PC original response to questions and a copy of the questions.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Philip Talbot** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, 10 Jul 2023 at 11:20
Subject: Buckhorn Weston /Kington Magna neighbourhood plan Reg14-Draft
To: <Preese@dorset.gov.uk>

Dear Mr Reese

I have obtained your details from the Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan and as such I am assuming you are familiar with the above document and to some extent may have been involved in its evolution.

You will probably be aware that an initial draft of the document has now been released to the residents along with a proforma questionnaire as part of a statutory 6 week consultation period.

In order to further understand the document I drafted a list of questions (attachment 1) seeking clarification on some of the terminology/issues raised by the draft document and its contained policy statements.

I forwarded a copy of my questions by email to the Parish Council on 28th June 2023 for a response/discussion on Monday 3 July 2023.

To date other than an acknowledgment of receipt no detailed response has been received. The matter was discussed at the PC meeting held Monday 3rd July, where the Chairman of the PC was minded not to respond.

I am sure you will appreciate that to comment, in a constructive manner, on a document as important as the NP one needs to understand both its content and implications.

This lack of response (from the Parish Council) seems to be a continuing trend where they appear reluctant to fully engage with the village population.

As an example after the original KM village public meeting to collate residents' views it was decided that it would be useful for the PC to issue a questionnaire including questions on a range of topics against which residents could indicate their views. The responses to this survey were collated by the contracted consultant and issued on the PC Website as a large spreadsheet.

Residents were not informed that the PC also commissioned from the consultants a summarising document of the responses collating all the statistical data into a readily understandable and more easily readable format. This document was reluctantly placed on the PC Website some time later after having been requested. As evidence I have attached emails on the subject. (Please note the dates on the email and the dates on issued document).

Further on the subject of seeking residents' views - The PC stipulate that only one response will be accepted from each household no matter how many people reside within the household. This constraint could be seen to restrict responses from people with differing views. Is this normal practise?

When this subject was raised at the PC meeting on 3 July The Chairman stated "they (residents) need to sort it out themselves."

Also in the past the PC Chairman has stated that "where no response from a residence is received the Council will assume the residents are in favour of the PC views." Is this normal practise?

One final point, again from the 3 July meeting, the PC indicated that even prior to the expiry date of the public consultation they are minded to not to consider any amendments to the Draft plan document but to forward to the review stage the existing document together with the received responses, ie. No public presentation on the results - Is this normal practise?).

Note (The PC failed to hold a public meeting prior to formal issue to the County Council)

I have sent you this information as I understand under the Government NP guidelines document issue 2020

Consulting on, and publicising, a neighbourhood plan or order. What is the role of the wider community in neighbourhood planning?

A qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its neighbourhood plan or Order and ensure that the wider community :

- Is kept fully informed of what is being proposed
- is able to make their views known throughout the process
- Has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging neighbourhood plan or Order
- Is made aware of how their views have informed the draft neighbourhood plan

In my opinion the PC seem to be reluctant to consider questions/other views and there is a scarcity of information on how views have informed the Draft NP

I understand that the public can forward to the Council information concerning their views for consideration to the independent examiner. I would be very grateful if you would be kind enough to forward this email and attachments (emails and questions to PC) to the examiner.

With many thanks

Yours sincerely

Philip Talbot

██████████

██████████

██████

██████████

Many thanks for your reply and your informed answers. (It is actually incredibly difficult to obtain clear answers if the drafting authority (in this case the Parish Council) are reluctant to provide information.

I would be most grateful for the details on the Extant Planning applications. (The PC request to you last week is probably a coincidence).

There is one other subject, in the NP which I think you may be able to clarify and that is the impact on the KM Conservation area.

The Draft NP distributed for comment contains little detail on the impact of any proposed settlement boundaries interaction with the Conservation area boundaries.

Would I be right in assuming that the NP would result in a 2 tier Conservation area. With CA land outside the S Boundary still being protected by "Countryside Wash over" and CA land inside the settlement having the protection of "Countryside Wash over removed"?

As an example the parcel of land bounded by Green lane, Back lane and Church Street was included in the C Area update 2018 and according to the parish Council "Designated as a site of archaeological importance" also described in the Conservation area approved document "The field to the rear of these properties forms an important buffer that maintains the village's historic limits and landscape setting and therefore is included in the conservation area" So it would seem this area has already been identified as an important feature (Gap) in an historical as well as a visual sense in shaping the character of the village.

In the draft NP this area is listed as "to be recommended to be defined as an important gap" But it is already an important gap from the Conservation Area documentation.

Surely there is a conflict here which important gap definition (Conservation area or NP) would take precedence?

One last little quirk The KM conservation area was subject to a referendum by residents of KM only. If changes to the Conservation area are being brought in by the proposed NP this would seem to indicate that residents of Buckhorn Weston can vote to modify the KM Conservation area. Is this a correct assumption?

Once again many thanks for your comments and time

Phil Talbot

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Attachment 2

Parish Council response to questions following their request for comments on issue 14 Draft and a copy of the questions asked

e mail Buckhorn Weston & Kington Magna Parish Council <buckhornweston@dorset-

Dear Philip,

Thank you for your email.

It is my understanding, and that of the other councillors who attended the last full council meeting on 3rd July, that the members advised you at that time that your list of questions, dated the 28th June, would not receive a response.

All of the information gathered and used to form the contents of the draft Neighbourhood Plan is available on the parish council's website, (including the Steering Group minutes from meetings held, reports from public NP meetings, results of previous surveys and analysis, updates at full council meetings, etc.) and can be found at www.bwandkmpc.org or by clicking this [link](#).

You are currently invited to complete the public consultation regarding the '*policies*' formed from the community's comments throughout this process which are now set out in the draft plan and I would urge you to do so either by submitting a hard copy or online via the PC website.

BWKM Neighbourhood Plan Reg 14-Final

Please find below comments on the above document for your consideration

1) The Foreword to the document reads:-

"In the case of Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna (The Settlement Boundaries) were in place until 2016 when North Dorset Council policy meant they were removed and villages were classed as countryside. In effect all expansion was quashed."

Can the Parish Council please confirm the continuing situation with regards to planning development in the villages should the Neighbourhood Plan be rejected. It is understood that there is no pressure for development from a County level

Would all development continue to be quashed?

2) Section 3 Para 51 states that "a significant degree of support among those responding to the survey was indicated for a limited amount of new local housing to meet local needs, specifically the young, the changing needs of the elderly and existing families who need new accommodation".

Can the Parish Council please clarify how the "significant degree of support among those responding" translates into a significant degree of support among all qualifying residents of the villages.

3) Section 3 para 60. "To complement the two events, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group ran a survey of parish residents (based on one survey form per address of residents who live in the parish).

Could the Parish Council advise if the policy of restricting responses to a questionnaire to a residence only, rather than allowing all qualifying residents to express their views is not considered discriminatory by nature and hence goes against the Parish Councils' own policy as defined by the statement "Members (of the Parish Council) are reminded that the Council has a general duty to consider the following matters in the exercise of any of its functions: Equal Opportunities (race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, marital status, age and any disability), Crime and Disorder, Health and Safety and Human Rights."

4) Section 4 para 73 Objective 1 – "Secure new housing to meet the needs of parish residents"

Could the Parish Council please clarify where in the document are stated the guidelines to ensure that new development would meet the need of parish residents.

5) Section 5 para 78. The para states that “A request was made to Dorset Council for the local housing requirement for the parish. The confirmed position is provided at Appendix A. The local housing requirement is based on the latest information and is provided for the period covered by the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan. This indicates a requirement for 12 dwellings over the period 2021 to 2038 and of this total 6 dwellings are extant planning permissions”

Extant planning permission is (I understand) defined as still valid and not yet expired.

Can the Parish Council please identify the relevant existing planning application numbers and clarify how these approved applications conform to the requirements stipulated in section 5 para 78 above.

Can the Parish Council confirm that the suggested total of 12 houses is a value determined by outside consultants and has not been proposed or agreed by the residents ?

6) “A further 6 dwellings would be expected through windfall over the period.”

Now that the Cross Garage development site has been rebranded as Brown field and the proposed settlement boundary extended to include the site it is assumed that this development will be re submitted. This is currently for 7 properties bringing the total to 13 (6 +7).

Can the Parish Council clarify how they would view this development within the guidelines of a proposed total requirement for 12 dwellings. The Cross Garage proposed development currently includes 3 detached and 4 semi detached residences.

How would the council review this application against the criteria to provide affordable housing for local needs?.

In addition, is the Parish Council aware of any further previously rejected applications that would now be looked on more favourably should the proposed settlement boundaries be reinstated?

7) Para 79 states “ In view of the current state of local plan preparation, the response makes clear that the parish is not restricted to this number provided that, in potentially seeking to deliver more housing, it aims to meet local and not strategic housing needs”. Could the council please clarify how this policy of no maximum number correlates to the residents' EXPRESSED DESIRE to have limited development?

8) Section 6 para 8 states“The Neighbourhood Plan has restored Settlement Boundaries around Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna because the community has expressed a clear wish to support limited amounts of new development to meet local needs.

Could the Parish Council please advise the evidence that residents of the village have expressed a clear wish to support limited amounts of new developments and that at the time of such expression the reference in Para 79 to apparent unlimited development was clearly explained?

During the early stages of the creation of the Neighbourhood Plan residents were advised that the document would define areas for development, areas for green spaces, play areas industrial areas etc. allowing such areas to be managed by the local community.

Could the Parish Council please advise where within the proposed settlement boundaries

the designated areas for development etc. are defined.

9) Section 6 para 95 The document reads “Within the Settlement Boundaries of Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna, planning applications for new development which meet the design principles set out in Table 4 and principles on development form set out in Table 5 will be supported.”

Could the Parish Council advise how this policy correlates to the residents' desire for limited development of affordable housing for local residents and also the requirement for a maximum 12 new properties. And has the stated aim for 2 bed bungalows for downsizing been completely removed.

10) Section 6 para 111 The document reads “The Neighbourhood Plan has been established with the purpose of facilitating the provision of more housing to meet identified local housing needs. It is supportive of new development within restored Settlement Boundaries to be provided where appropriate through infill development, back land development, plot intensification and development on brownfield plots.”

Can the Parish Council advise how they intend to ensure housing development meets local needs during the extended period of the Plan.

11) Section 6 Para 111 The document states “No estimate has been made of how many new homes could be delivered through these means and no site allocations have been proposed for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan”.

Could the Parish Council explain why they are unable to identify proposed sites for development as this was one of the original stated aims for the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan to give residents the control over where development would take place and specify the limited number of residences to be developed. This would seem to totally defeat the whole purpose of the document leading to unlimited development in undisclosed locations.

12) Para 120 Document reads “Future size and type requirements – The HNA suggests that the majority of new dwellings in the plan area between now and 2038 should be 2-bedrooms, with 54.6% of new properties suggested to be of this size in order to meet the indicative mix. This is followed by 36.5% 1-bedroom dwellings and 8.9% 3-bedroom dwellings. It is suggested that further development of larger dwellings would not be needed purely in housing supply terms.”

Can the Parish Council advise how the above is reflected by the statement “Para 122 POLICY BWKM 4 - LOCAL HOUSING REQUIREMENTS Within the Settlement Boundaries of Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna, planning applications for the development of two-bedroom and three-bedroom homes will be prioritised in order to meet identified local housing needs. If as indicated above there is little requirement for 3 bedroom houses.

13) Para 121 the document reads “The HNA analysis indicates that a growing population of increasingly elderly people living in small households (singles or couples with no children) are occupying the largest houses in the BWKM. It is suggested that they might wish to move into smaller properties”.

Could the Parish Council advise who has suggested this advice and where is the evidence that there is a local desire to downsize locally?

14) Section 8 para 139 The document reads “POLICY BWKM 7 - IMPORTANT GAPS
The following sites, shown on Figure 2 and Figure 4, are designated as Important Gaps
which make a significant contribution to the character of their settlement in the context of
wider Landscape Character. Development will only be supported which avoids a reduction
in, and function of, the Important Gaps”

Could the Parish Council advise what exactly the statement (Development will only be
supported which avoids a reduction in, and function of, the Important Gaps) means and
how this differs from other potential development sites.

15) Para 134 The document states ”the Recommendation to be designated as an
important gap.”The words to be designated would suggest that this important feature in protecting
the layout of the villages has yet to be agreed. Could the Parish Council please advise what further
actions are required to formalise such designations and can the neighbourhood plan be formalised
without such agreement.

Representation number: 9

From: Mr R Hannam, resident of Kington Magna

Submitted: 19 December 2023

Comments:-

Land between back lane green lane and church street, my concerns of the removal of iows and site of archaeological importance will leave the site now put as important gap in the concervation area open for development as under green infrastructure ch 8

Taking us back to 2016-2018 when it was suggested a village hall and 5 houses with houses in front of the bungalows and the village hall and car park backing on to the ex local authority house . i hope we are not going back to this with bungalows being overlooked and light and veiws blocked and the local authority house with long gardens a wide footpath and hedge row having a single storey building at the bottom of their gardens . i hope that as table 4 Design principle for new development regading size in harmony with adjacent propertys and blend with adjacent properties. also heights are appropriate in relation with veiws vistas and skylines. i live at the lower side of the field with land rising up to back lane and green lane my property is very close to field buiding houses in front of me would cut the light out of my property . i also think we are talking about homes here not village halls which need to be in a green space on its own as in many surrounding villages . it was suggested when this plan was rolled out earlier

this year to build 5 houses and a village hall in Mr highnams field behind the bungalows on west street this has got everyone on west street and south street to vote for the plan as the boundry runs along the bottom of their gardens

they are not in favour of building houses they dont want them behind them although the parish council

suggests a majority are in favour. at the moment i am not in favour if nobody can assure me of the issues i have brought to your attention here . i would understand the need to build affordable homes if we had a school as we had when i was small and lived in buckhorn weston both villages had schools shops ect no public transport . i have sent in the questionair to the parish council and sent questions to philip reece i also have documents relating to 2018 . iam just fed up with this reoccurring every 7 years could please let me know one way or the other yours robin hannam

Representation number: 10

From: Philip Reese, Senior Planning Policy Officer

Organisation: Dorset Council

Submitted: 22 December 2023

Comments:-

Dorset Council welcomes progress of the Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna neighbourhood plan, and supports its vision and objectives. We have commented extensively on earlier versions, including the Regulation 14 version (as evidenced by the submitted Consultation Report). We are pleased to say that the vast majority of our previous comments have been taken on board. Therefore, our comments at this stage are more limited and generally relate to what we consider as outstanding matters. We hope that these comments help to finalise the plan ready for referendum.

Section / Relevant NP text	DC comments
Para 30 “The current version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in September 2023.”	A revised NPPF was published on 19 December 2023. The changes have various implications for decision making (such as calculating housing land supply), however the changes are more limited with regard to the production of neighbourhood plans. One prominent change is the additional references to “beautiful buildings” in various parts of the NPPF; this reinforces the need for locally supported design policies, such as those contained in neighbourhood plans.
Table 3	As a consequence of a revised NPPF in Dec 2023, some of the NPPF paragraph numbers require updating. The old and the new paragraph numbers are (where the NPPF text has changed, this has also been noted): 112(c) -> 116(c) 120(e) -> 124(e) – additional section to cover mansard roofs 125 -> 129 129-131 -> 134-136 62 -> 63 – with small amendments, including more detail on older people’s house 63 -> 64 185(c) -> 191(c) 152 -> 157 154-155 -> 159-160 92 -> 96 – now with reference to beautiful buildings 174 -> 180 101-103 -> 105-107
Para 70 “Ways to secure better public transport services from the villages to nearby towns are important to residents of the parishes.”	Response from the Transport Planning team: Due to the limited development within the parish, there is little scope for transport improvements because funding for such enhancements are typically funded by developments. Therefore, in paragraph 70, it would be useful to add a sentence about securing additional/improved community transport services. This is a more realistic solution to improve the public transport services within the parish.

Section / Relevant NP text	DC comments
<p>Para 84 “A further area, south of the railway line is included within the settlement boundary reflecting the community’s view of this area being part of the village based on a former garage use on one plot (making it a brownfield plot) and an existing dwelling which forms the entrance to the village.”</p>	<p><i>The following largely repeats comments made to the Regulation 14 consultation. The qualifying body’s response to those original comments can be found in paras 188–191 of the Consultation Report.</i></p> <p>Regarding the intention to include the area of land south of the railway line into the settlement boundary – part of this area (Cross’s Garage) has been subject to two recent unsuccessful applications for residential development (DC refs 2/2017/1572/FUL for 8 dwellings and P/FUL/2021/02758 for 7 dwellings). The first application for 8 dwellings was also dismissed at appeal (PINS ref APP/N1215/W/18/3202418 – appeal decision attached). It is understood that the parish council were supportive of the principle of redeveloping this site. We have therefore recommended to the parish council that the area should be formally allocated for housing, with a policy setting out some basic parameters for its redevelopment (e.g. size, scale, orientation, and access arrangements).</p> <p>The Inspector’s report regarding the appeal decision considers the character and appearance of the proposal. The report finds that the “small cul-de-sac ... would have a suburban character” and “would be out of keeping with the form of the development found in the locality.” In the planning balance, the Inspector gives this harm significant weight, which, along with the limited accessibility of the site, is sufficient to outweigh the benefits of the scheme (notwithstanding the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’). The reasons for refusal for the second planning application (which again was for a small cul-de-sac development but for one fewer units) cited “harm to local character” due to “excessive number of dwellings, semi-urbanising and cramped layout.”</p> <p>The proposed NP contains a generic design policy (BWKM3). Table 4 says that “The community’s main priority is for the design of new development to reflect existing character,” and also: “Development is mostly linear off existing village lanes with no snickets and cut-throughs. New development is likely to follow the same form, close to existing lanes.” It is therefore not clear whether the proposal for a small cul-de-sac, which the parish council supported, would be in accordance with the policies in the draft NP. For this reason, we feel it would be better to set out clearly some design parameters as part of a formal site allocation for the former garage site. In that way, both the applicant and the community would have a clearer idea of what might be appropriate.</p> <p>It is noted that the Settlement Boundary Methodology, published alongside the draft NP, states: “Avoid inclusion of open areas that could result in larger scale development.” It further explains:</p>

Section / Relevant NP text	DC comments
	<p>“There will be a threshold (an informal one based on judgement) above which infill land, backland, or other plots suitable for redevelopment, becomes something more strategic, and this would be considered a site allocation. The consideration would be based on matters of scale, impact, fairness, transparency etc. As a guide to thinking, including land that could accommodate more than two dwellings is akin to a site allocation, requiring a different procedure.” If it is the view of the qualifying body that the Cross’s Garage site isn’t capable of accommodating more than two dwellings (and therefore a cul-de-sac layout would not be necessary), then this needs to be clarified.</p> <p>The draft plan notes that this is a former garage site, and therefore there is a possibility of ground contamination. The Environmental Health Officer was consulted on the first planning application and replied in January 2018 with: “Contamination likely and would need to be a condition attached to any permission.” The case officer wrote in his report: “The site is highly likely to be contaminated given its last use. No information has been given to suggest how this would be addressed were residential development with gardens constructed.” I’m unable to find anything on file that confirms that contamination has been ruled out. Therefore, the issue of potential contamination on the site could usefully be mentioned in the NP. For reference, the topic of pollution and contaminated land is covered by NPPF (Dec 2023) paras 189 and 190 and saved LP Policy 1.20 from the 2003 LP.</p>
<p>Section 5 and policies BWKM1 and BWKM2</p>	<p>This section deals with the reinstatement of the village settlement boundaries. Read on its own it is not clear what this means in practice. While the implications are set out on the first page of Section 6, it might be useful if a short summary is given in this section and/or a reference to Section 6 is made for more information. It might also be useful if policies BWKM1 and 2 were clearer regarding what the SB means. For example, they could state that the restrictive countryside policies do not apply within the SB, but development proposals should meet the requirements of policy BWKM3.</p>
<p>Paras 127–130 and Policy BWKM 6</p>	<p>Having declared a climate emergency, Dorset Council recognises the need and local support to encourage better sustainability in new development, particularly in advance of mandatory building regulation standards. For this reason, DC published in December 2023 the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning for climate change - Interim guidance and position statement & separate appendix B - to help decision makers weigh up the benefits of addressing climate change with other material considerations. It addresses sustainable design and construction and planning for renewable energy schemes.

Section / Relevant NP text	DC comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability checklist and guidance - This sets out questions for applicants to check in relation to their schemes' sustainable design and construction. The checklist will become a requirement from 15 Jan 2024. • Listed buildings and energy efficiency - what you can do for climate change - to help householders with what they can do to increase energy efficiency in listed buildings. <p>Much of what is in Policy BWKM6 is covered by the guidance documents and sustainability checklist. As such, DC supports this policy as it is evidence of the local support for increased sustainability measures in this neighbourhood area, and complements our work in this area. Potentially the policy and/or supporting text could be amended to include reference to the Sustainability Checklist which will become a requirement in 2024.</p>
<p>Policy BWKM 6 "Installation of Electric Vehicle chargepoints at existing residential, commercial and community buildings."</p>	<p><i>Response from the Transport Planning team:</i></p> <p>We are supportive of the installation of Electric Vehicle chargepoints at existing residential, commercial and community buildings as mentioned in Policy BWKM6.</p>
<p>Paras 134-136</p>	<p>A paragraph is given to each of the proposed Important Gaps in the supporting text above policy BWKM 7, apart from Field to rear of Green land and Church Street, Kington Magna. This could be an omission.</p>
<p>Para 136 "At land east of West Street, Kington Magna..."</p>	<p>Clarify that this refers to the north site and not the south site (which is not proposed to be an Important Gap).</p>

<attached appeal decision starts on next page>



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2018

by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/N1215/W/18/3202418

Cross's Garage, Templecombe Lane to Hartmoor Hill, Buckhorn Weston SP8 5HF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Hopkins Developments Ltd against the decision of North Dorset District Council.
 - The application Ref 2/2017/1572/FUL, dated 29 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of eight dwellings, provision of access, landscaping and other ancillary works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are:
 - Whether, having regard to local and national planning policies, the site is a suitable location for new housing;
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - having regard to the Council's current supply of deliverable housing sites, if any adverse impacts are identified, whether they would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits when the proposal is assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) taken as a whole.

Reasons

Location

3. Policy 2 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (the LP) sets out the Council's spatial strategy and requires that development proposals should be located in the four main towns, Stalbridge, or the larger villages. Outside of the defined boundaries of these settlements the remainder of the district is to be subject to countryside policies where development will be strictly controlled unless it is required to enable essential rural needs. Policy 20 of the LP sets out that development in the countryside will only be permitted if it is a type of development that is specifically listed or if there is an overriding need for it to be located in the countryside.

4. The appeal site is located a little to the south of the village of Buckhorn Weston. This settlement is not one of the identified larger villages. In general terms there is no need for open market housing to be located in the countryside and the development does not meet with any of the listed types of development referenced in Policy 20. The proposal would not accord with the Council's spatial strategy.
5. Buckhorn Weston contains a public house, a village hall, a church as well as some recreational facilities. These are not sufficient to meet the day-to-day needs of residents. The site is located relatively close to Gillingham and Wincanton, both of which contain a good range of services and facilities as well as public transport links. However, the distances involved are too far to encourage walking, and while for some the distance to these settlements would be achievable by cycling, it would not be an attractive option for many. This would mean that future residents of the appeal development would be largely reliant on a private vehicle.
6. The Framework requires that it should be ensured that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be taken up, given the type of development and its location. Providing housing in a rural location will inevitably mean that accessibility to services and facilities will be less than ideal, but this remains a material consideration. In this case the very limited services and facilities in the locality is a factor that weighs against the proposal. I will return to the matter of accessibility in the final main issue.
7. The Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway safety grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The appeal development does not raise highway safety issues and so there would not be conflict with this part of the Framework, but nor does this add any positive weight in favour of the development.

Character and appearance

8. Buckhorn Weston is a small village with a pleasant, spacious and rural feel. In general the housing, and other buildings, in the settlement sit in relatively large plots. The appeal site is located to the south of the railway bridge. It is some distance from the built edge of the village and it appears as being separate from it. It is apparent that the site previously contained commercial buildings, but these have now been removed. At the time of my visit the site was largely colonised by scrubby vegetation.
9. There is a single detached dwelling, with a large garage building to the rear, located immediately adjacent to the site. This single dwelling with its large garden fits in comfortably with the rural character of the immediate area where sporadic buildings are not uncommon.
10. The development would be in the form of a small cul-de-sac. Three houses would front the highway with the remainder being set to the rear, along with 2 garage buildings. The dwellings would be closely spaced together with a layout that would have a suburban character. In other contexts the development would not represent a particularly high density, however it would be out of keeping with the form of the development found in the locality. Even with landscaping the form of the development would be apparent from the highway

and public footpaths, and it would appear harmfully out of keeping with the rural character of the area.

11. There would not be long-range views of the appeal development but this does not diminish the harm that would arise from shorter-range views. The proximity of the site to the railway line does not lessen the rural character of the area and so this would not mitigate the harm.
12. The design of the dwellings has incorporated features akin to a village vernacular and a range of materials would be used, some of which are common to the locality. However, these factors would do little to lessen the impact of the development which would primarily result from the suburban form and layout.
13. I noted that there was temporary fencing to the front of the site, which is not an attractive feature, but nor is this permanent. Otherwise the site now largely blends into the landscape and it does not stand out as being intrusive to the rural character of the immediate area. Therefore I do not consider that the appeal scheme would represent an improvement.
14. On this issue, I therefore conclude that the development would result in very significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with policies 4, 7, and 24 of the LP. Together these policies seek to protect the landscape character of the district, and ensure that development is designed to respect and improve the character, quality and distinctiveness of the locality. The development would also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character and would maintain a strong sense of place.

Implications of the supply of deliverable housing sites

15. There is no dispute that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The evidence suggests that this currently amounts to 3.42 years. Having regard to paragraph 11 of the Framework this means that the policies which are the most important for determining the application should be considered out of date. It also means that planning permission should be granted unless specified policies in the Framework provide a clear reason for refusing the development, or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Policy 1 of the LP contains similar provisions.
16. The development would not conflict with any of the specified policies in footnote 6 of the Framework and so this is not a relevant factor in this case. The degree of undersupply is not insignificant and the provision of 8 dwellings would result in a small, but important, redress to this. There would be economic benefits from the construction phase and residents would then support the services and facilities in the village and wider area. These factors weigh significantly in favour of the development.
17. I do not consider that the appeal site is isolated, however this matter is not decisive by itself but it does very modestly weigh in favour of the development. The site was previously occupied by buildings and I do also give limited positive weight to this factor. I have also taken account of the support from the Parish

Council, however I must have regard to the Framework when it is considered as a whole and so this is not an overriding consideration.

18. The benefits of the development would be important. However, even when I consider the totality of the positive factors these would not outweigh the very significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and the harm that would result from the limited accessibility of the site. There would be conflict with Policy 1 of the LP and the Framework when it is taken as a whole.
19. There has been reference to a Policy in a neighbouring Council's development plan. However, I must consider the appeal having regard to the adopted local plan for this Council and national policy.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor
INSPECTOR