

Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of responses to the Regulation 16 consultation

1 May 2024

The Regulation 16 consultation was held between 10 November and 22 December 2023.

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

Summary of responses

Person / organisation	Comments
Cranborne Chase AONB	<p>The Dark Skies statements in the plan are very welcome, but do not go far enough.</p> <p>The PIR motion detector "on" time needs to be limited.</p> <p>There is no mention of light emission from internal sources via roof lights and extensively glazed elevations.</p> <p>There is no mention of the height of walkway lighting.</p>

Person / organisation	Comments
	<p>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/)</p> <p>We would welcome amended and additional statements of policy under POLICY BWKM 5 - LIGHTING SCHEMES as follows:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>h) External lighting shall have a maximum correlated colour temperature (CCT) of 2700K.</p>
National Highways	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Person / organisation	Comments
	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.
Gillingham Town Council	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.
Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.
Historic England	<p>Thank you for your Regulation 16 consultation on the submitted version of the Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I can confirm that there are no issues associated with the Plan upon which we wish to comment.</p>
Environment Agency	Thank you for consulting us on Buckhorn Weston and Kington Magna Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 16 consultation, we have no further comments to make.
J Sledge (resident)	<p>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.</p> <p>We have one brown field site in Buckhorn Weston which is getting overgrown and attracting vermin and we really need this to be developed.</p>
P Talbot (resident)	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Person / organisation	Comments
	<p>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.</p>
R Hannam (resident)	<p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p>
Dorset Council	See following section

Dorset Council's response

Section / Relevant NP text	Dorset Council comments
<p>Para 30 “The current version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in September 2023.”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Table 3</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>Para 70 “Ways to secure better public transport services from the villages to nearby towns are important to residents of the parishes.”</p>	<p><i>Response from the Transport Planning team:</i></p> <p>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.</p>

Section / Relevant NP text	Dorset Council 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). 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: “There will be a</p>

Section / Relevant NP text	Dorset Council comments
	<p>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

Section / Relevant NP text	Dorset Council comments
	<p>considerations. It addresses sustainable design and construction and planning for renewable energy schemes.</p> <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>